DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 367 757 UD 029 778

TITLE	Violence in the Schools. A National, State, and Local Crisis.
INSTITUTION	New York State Education Dept., Albany. Office for Planning, Research, and Support Services.
PUB DATE	Jan 94
NOTE	81p.
AVAILABLE FROM	New York State Education Department, Office for Planning, Research and Support Services, Education Building Addition, Room 375, Albany, NY 12234.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administration; Community Influence; Crime; *Crime Prevention; *Delinquency; Disadvantaged Youth; *Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Etiology; Family Influence; Federal Government; Interpersonal Communication; Intervention; Police School Relationship; Prevention; *School Security; Social Problems; State Government; Urban Schools; *Violence
IDENTIFIERS	*New York

ABSTRACT

This study explores the problem of school violence, identifies the causes and factors associated with this violence, and discusses strategies to reduce violence in the schools. Federal, New York State, and other state initiatives are presented, focusing on reducing violence in schools. Factors associated with school violence and vandalism are identified in the following categories: (1) governance of schools; (2) interpersonal communication; (3) leadership; (4) other school-related factors; (5) society and community-related factors; (6) family-related factors; and (7) behavior. Violence-reduction strategies for schools are discussed in the areas of prevention, intervention, and response. Initiatives undertaken by the Federal Government, New York, and other states to reduce and prevent violence are reviewed. Several surveys planned to elucidate the extent of school violence are described. Appendixes present definitions and a chart of district violence statistics, along with 27 tables of national violence survey results. (Contains 47 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 367 757

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: UD

In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. EA

IN THE SCHOOLS

A National, State, and Local Crisis

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

UD 029778

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Clusson
NY State Ed. Dept.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Education Department of New York • The State Education Department • Office for Planning, Research and Support Services

VIOLENCE IN THE SCHOOLS

A National, State, and Local Crisis

The University of the State of New York • The State Education Department • Office for Planning, Research and Support Services
January 1994

(U) 029778

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Regents of The University

R. Carlos Carballada, *Chancellor*, B.S.	Rochester
Jorge L. Batista, *Vice Chancellor*, B.A., J.D.	Bronx
Willard A. Genrich, *Chancellor Emeritus*, LL.B.	Buffalo
Emlyn I. Griffith, A.B., J.D.	Rome
Louise P. Matteoni, B.A., M.A., Ph.D.	Bayside
J. Edward Meyer, B.A., LL.B.	Chappaqua
Floyd S. Linton, A.B., M.A., M.P.A.	Miller Place
Mimi Levin Lieber, B.A., M.A.	New York
Shirley C. Brown, B.A., M.A., Ph.D.	Albany
Norma Gluck, B.A., M.S.W.	New York
Adelaide L. Sanford, B.A., M.A., P.D.	Hollis
Walter Cooper, B.A., Ph.D.	Rochester
Carl T. Hayden, A.B., J.D.	Elmira
Diane O'Neill McGivern, B.S.N., M.A., Ph.D.	Staten Island
Saul B. Cohen, B.A., M.A., Ph.D.	New Rochelle
James C. Dawson, A.A., B.A., M.S., Ph.D.	Peru

President of The University and Commissioner of Education

Thomas Sobol

Executive Deputy Commissioner of Education

Thomas E. Sheldon

Coordinator for Planning, Research and Support Services

Julio Vidal

The State Education Department does not discriminate on the basis of age, color, religion, creed, disability, marital status, veteran status, national origin, race, gender or sexual orientation in the educational programs and activities which it operates. Portions of this publication can be made available in a variety of formats, including braille, large print or audio tape, upon request. Inquiries concerning this policy of equal opportunity and affirmative action should be referred to the Department's Affirmative Action Officer, NYS Education Department, 89 Washington Avenue, Albany, NY 12234.

(1) On or before January 1, 1986 each school district shall adopt and implement a written policy on school conduct and discipline designed to promote responsible student behavior. The City School District of the City of New York shall adopt and implement a separate written policy for each community school district and for Central Board-administered programs. Such a policy shall be developed locally in consultation with teachers, administrators, other school service professionals, students and parents and shall include:

(i) a bill of rights and responsibilities of students which focuses upon positive student behavior, and which shall be publicized and explained to all students on an annual basis;

(ii) a discipline code for student behavior setting forth prohibited student conduct and the range of penalties which may be imposed for violation of such code, which shall be publicized and explained to all students and provided in writing to all parents on an annual basis. Such code shall describe the roles of teachers, administrators, board of education members, and parents;

(iii) strategies and procedures for the maintenance and enforcement of public order on school property, which shall govern the conduct of all persons on school premises ...;

(iv) procedures within each building to involve pupil service personnel, administrators, teachers, parents and students in the early identification and resolution of discipline problems. For students identified as having handicapping conditions, such policy shall include procedures for determining when a student's conduct shall constitute a reason for referral to the committee on special education for review and modification, if appropriate, of the student's individualized education program;

(v) alternative educational programs appropriate to individual student needs;

(vi) disciplinary measures for violation of the school policies developed in accordance with subparagraphs (ii) and (iii) of this paragraph. Such measures shall be appropriate to the seriousness of the offense and, where applicable, to the previous disciplinary record of the student. Any suspension from attendance upon instruction may be imposed only in accordance with [Education Law];

(vii) guidelines and programs for in-service education programs for all district staff members to ensure effective implementation of school policy on school conduct and discipline.

(2) The board of education shall adopt such a policy, review it on an annual basis and amend it when appropriate. Each school district's policy on school conduct and discipline shall be filed in each school building, and shall be available for review by any individual.

Commissioner's Regulations, § 100.2 (l)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Special acknowledgment is given to a number of staff in the State Education Department for their efforts in the preparation of this report.

The Office for Planning, Research and Support Services (OPRSS) was responsible for the development of the document. Under the leadership and supervision of **Julio Vidal**, **Raymond Kesper** had primary responsibility for researching and drafting the paper. **Kevin McCarthy** contributed to the design and preparation of selected charts and tables. **Virginia Milne** was responsible for the publication production process.

Finally, the Center for Art and Design, the Publications Unit and the Address Labeling Unit are to be commended for their efforts in the design, reproduction and the distribution of the material.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM 2
- Background 2
- Federal Data Gathering 3
- New York State Data Gathering 5

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH SCHOOL VIOLENCE AND VANDALISM 6
- School Violence 6
- School Vandalism 10

STRATEGIES TO REDUCE VIOLENCE IN SCHOOLS 11
- Prevention Strategies 11
- Intervention Strategies 24
- Response Strategies 25

INITIATIVES TO REDUCE VIOLENCE IN SCHOOLS 27
- Federal Initiatives 27
- New York State Initiatives 28
- Other State Initiatives 29

CONCLUSION 30

APPENDICES 32
- A. Definitions 32
- B. Violence in New York City High Schools, 1992-1993 School Year 33
- C. Tables: National Crime Victimization Survey Findings 37

BIBLIOGRAPHY 71

Introduction

Many inner city schools and their surrounding neighborhoods are becoming the battleground of America. Children and others are committing acts of violence against each other, teachers and other school personnel with alarming frequency. Still, a comprehensive action plan has yet to be developed at the local, State, or Federal level to stem this tide of violence.

In the case of New York City, violence has risen 61 percent in the public schools since June 1989, with the most dramatic increases in recent years. For the 1992-93 school year, crime rose 16 percent, as compared to 1991-92. In 1991-1992, school crime increased 29 percent over the previous academic year. This increase was in all five categories of school crime compiled by the New York City Board of Education — assault, robbery, sex offense, controlled substance, and weapon possessions — with the majority of incidents in approximately 40 of the 124 City high schools (Appendix B) (Barbanel, *The New York Times*, September 16, 1993; McFadden, *The New York Times*, September 4, 1992).

The widening specter of violence in schools should be of increasing concern to all Americans. The impact of school violence goes beyond the victims of the crime and their families, but "it reduces the effectiveness of public education, particularly in large cities" (Toby, 1980, p. 32), and has negative consequences for the school environment and the quality of community life, in general.

The incidence of school violence is regularly reported in the press. In February 1992, the shooting deaths of two students by another student at Thomas Jefferson High School in Brooklyn received considerable attention in the news media. The Jefferson High School incident and similar incidents have come to represent in the mind of the public the environment of urban public schools.

Violence among youth is not only a problem of large city schools. Increasingly, it is emerging in small city, suburban and rural areas (Kantrowitz, *Newsweek*, August 2, 1993; Hull, *Time*, August 2, 1993).

Have public schools become unsafe environments where students fear for their safety? In many cases "the fear of crime is more pervasive and damaging than actual criminal acts" (Becker, 1983, p. 46).

If children are to continue to learn, then schools must be made safe again. Everyone — parents, students, school personnel, community leaders, and other concerned individuals — must be involved in addressing the problem. Recognizing the need for action, the State Education Department, as a first step, has developed this background paper on school violence. The purpose of this paper is to explore the problem of school violence, identify the causes and factors associated with violence, and discuss strategies to reduce violence in the schools. Federal, New York State, and other state initiatives are presented focusing on reducing violence in the schools.

Concurrently, Governor Cuomo has called for a comprehensive strategy for addressing gun-related violence — *A Strategy for Action Against Gun-Related Violence*. As one of many action steps, the State Education Department and the State Division of Criminal Justice Services have implemented a statewide study of the prevalence of violence in schools. As part of the study, a survey was distributed to all school superintendents and a sample of teachers, students, and principals throughout the State during the spring of 1993. The survey data, currently being analyzed, should help policymakers, school professionals, parents, students, and the general public to gain a better understanding of the problem of school violence and lead to the development and support of programs to make schools safer. The completed study is scheduled for statewide dissemination in the winter of 1994.

Statement of the Problem

Background

The prevalence of violence in schools across the Nation is of increasing concern. Violence, which is associated with large inner city schools in the minds of the public, is now spreading to smaller city, suburban and rural schools.

Since the mid-1980s violence has climbed steadily throughout the Nation. Violent crimes (i.e., murder, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault) increased by 36 percent since 1985, from 557 violent crimes per 100,000 individuals in 1985 to 758 per 100,000 individuals in 1991 (U.S. Department of Justice, August 1992). New York State has a much higher violent crime rate than the national average, 1,163 violent crimes per 100,000 individuals in 1991 (N.Y.S. Division of Criminal Justice Services, 1992), with most of the crime in the State occurring in New York City.

Deaths resulting from violence is higher in the United States than in 21 other industrialized countries. According to the U.S. Center for Health Statistics (1987), there were 22 homicides per 100,000 individuals in the United States, while the homicide rates in the other 21 industrialized were all under five per 100,000 individuals. Over 25,000 individuals are killed each year in the United States (U.S. Department of Justice, August 1992). In fact, the homicide rate for young males in the United States is not only the highest among 22 developed countries, it is more than four times higher than the country with the next highest rate, Scotland, and more than 40 times higher than the country with the lowest rate, Japan (Fingerhut & Kleinman, 1990).

Violence among youth also began a dramatic climb in the mid-1980s. In 1991, as compared to 1985, the number of youth 18 years of age or younger arrested nationwide for serious violent crimes was up 34 percent (U.S. Department of Justice, August 1992). In New York State, the increase in these arrests was even higher — 41 percent. Also, New York State experienced the greatest increase among the 50 states in arrests for murder — 138 percent. Firearms were used in 78 percent of all New York State homicides involving 15- to 19-year-old victims during 1990 (N.Y.S. Division of Criminal Justice Services, June 1992).

Youth involved in gun-related crimes also has risen dramatically in recent years. From 1987 to 1990, arrests of 7- to 15-year-olds for weapons offenses rose 75 percent in New York City. Among youths 16 to 19 years-old, arrests for possession or use of a firearm rose over 50 percent from 1986 to 1991; youth in this age group accounted for 28 percent of the gun-related arrests in 1991 in both New York City and statewide (N.Y.S. Division of Criminal Justice Services, June 1992).

A recent Louis Harris survey presented a startling picture of school violence. The survey was conducted from April 19 to May 21, 1993, and included 2,508 students in grades 6 to 12 in 96 schools. Results of the survey indicated that 9 percent of the students had shot at someone at some time; 11 percent had been shot at in the past year; nearly 40 percent knew someone who had been killed or injured by a gun; and 15 percent had carried a gun within 30 days of the survey. In addition, 7 percent of the students said that their schools used metal detectors and 55 percent said they wanted their schools to use such detectors (Chira, *The New York Times*, July 20, 1993).

Another survey conducted September 22-October 5, 1993 by Louis Harris and Associates has provided additional evidence about school violence and its impact on school performance. The survey found that approximately 25 percent of the students and 10 percent of the teachers say they have been victims of violence on or near school property. It also found that 13 percent of the students surveyed "said they carried a weapon to school at some time, but that threats with weapons were more common than their use." Additionally, the survey found that 21 percent of the students with poor grades had threatened a teacher in some way, and that 40 percent of the students who received generally poor grades claimed that they were victims of crimes (*The New York Times*, Friday, December 17, 1993, p. A-37).

Violence and weapons in schools are more visible in large urban areas where the volume of incidents draws media attention. During the 1991-92 school year alone, the number of serious incidents in New York City schools increased 29 percent from the previous year (N.Y.C. Public Schools, 1992). During this same year, more than 3,000 weapons — including 189 guns — were confiscated from students in New York City schools (N.Y.C. Public Schools, 1992).

Violence in schools is not restricted to large urban school districts. While crime statistics show that violent crime rates decrease with urban density for both reported and unreported crime in the general population (N.Y.S. Division of Criminal Justice Services, 1992; U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1992), this pattern does not hold for crime in schools. A survey of crime victimization in Illinois schools found higher levels of assault and theft in suburban schools than in large urban schools (Illinois Criminal Justice Information Agency, 1992). Also, in a recent survey by the New York State United Teachers (NYSUT) (1993) of presidents of elementary and secondary teacher locals, over 80 percent of the respondents indicated that classroom discipline problems were more pronounced and frequent in 1992 than they were five years earlier.

School violence is demoralizing for students and teachers alike, and inevitably affects them physically, psychologically, and academically. The Illinois surveys found that 25 percent of the students and 18 percent of the teachers thought they might be "hurt or bothered" by someone at school. Eight percent of the students reported that they sometimes stayed home because they feared they would be hurt or bothered by someone at school. Similarly, teachers who expressed a greater fear of victimization than other teachers were absent more often than those who were less fearful (Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, 1991). In New York State, more than 10,000 members of New York State United Teachers have been victims of school violence since the 1990-91 school year (NYSUT, 1993).

School districts in New York City and elsewhere generally have responded to the escalating violence in schools by increasing security staff and metal detector use in the most troubled schools and by implementing programs designed to reduce student violence. Violence-prevention programs generally focus on conflict resolution, peer mediation, and improvement of self-esteem and decision-making skills. Despite efforts to reduce violence, public concern about the safety of children in schools continues to grow. Recent shootings in some schools have fueled the apprehension of students, parents, teachers, and the public about school safety.

Federal Data Gathering

On the national level, the U.S. Department of Justice provided insight into the problem of school violence. In 1991, the U.S. Department of Justice issued a series of reports on crime — **Violent Crime in the United States, Teenage Victims: A National Crime Survey,** and **School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report.** Of the three reports, the findings of the **School Crime** report are most pertinent to the scope of violence in the schools. The report summarized the responses collected by the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) in a special supplement during the first half of 1989. The NCVS findings were based on a nationally representative sample of 10,000 students out of total student population of approximately 21.6 million students, 12 to 19 years-old. It also accounts for selected characteristics of schools and students — including both public and nonpublic institutions.

The NCVS asked students for their perceptions regarding such crime issues as: How easy or hard is it for someone to get alcoholic beverages, marijuana, cocaine, crack, uppers/downers, and/or other illegal drugs at school? Have you attended any drug education classes in your school during the last six months? Are there any street gangs at school? Did a student attack or threaten to attack a teacher in your school? How prevalent are street gangs in school? How often are you afraid that someone will attack or harm you at school?

Following is a summary of the salient findings from the National Crime Victimization Survey (See Appendix B, Tables 1-27, for detailed information).

■ Victimization

Gender and race were not factors in student victimization.

Measurable differences were found in student victimization in regard to age, residence change, and property crime.

Also, measurable differences in student victimization were found between public school and nonpublic school students and between ninth grade students and all higher grades. Public school students were more likely to have experienced criminal victimization than nonpublic school students.

■ Drugs and Alcohol in School

Drugs

Of the mostly commonly used drugs — marijuana, cocaine, and crack — the perception among students was that marijuana is the easiest drug to obtain at school; 30 percent of students indicated that marijuana was easy to obtain, followed by cocaine and crack. However, students' reporting of the availability of drugs in school did not vary significantly by ethnicity or levels of family income.

By a significant margin, public school students were more likely than nonpublic school students to indicate that drugs were available in their schools. Students from nonmetropolitan areas were more likely than students from central and suburban areas to report the availability of drugs in their schools.

Students who said drugs were easy to obtain at school were more likely to have experienced victimization than students who said someone would find drugs either hard or impossible to obtain. In addition, students in schools where drugs were available feared being attacked both at school and going to or from school.

Drug Prevention

Students in schools where drugs where available, as compared to students in schools where drugs were not a problem, indicated that drug prevention measures have been enacted. Some of the measures that have been implemented by schools to prevent student drug use include locker searches, security guards, hall patrols, and restroom checks, among others.

Alcohol

Approximately the same proportion of students indicated that alcohol was easy or hard to obtain at school. However, students who indicated that alcohol was easy to obtain were more likely to have experienced property crime victimization than students who reported that alcohol was hard or impossible to obtain. Non-Hispanic students were more likely than Hispanic students to indicate that alcohol could be obtained at school.

In regard to grade level, the higher the grade level, the greater the availability of alcohol at school. Reflecting the findings of availability of drugs and fear of attack, students who reported alcohol to be available at school feared attack more than students from schools where alcohol was not a problem.

■ Gangs

A majority of students reported that no gangs existed at their schools, with a comparable percentage of students indicating that no attack or threat against teachers had occurred. Among all students, students who indicated the presence of gangs were more likely to have experienced some type of victimization than students from schools without gangs.

Approximately the same percentage of students of differing ages indicated the existence of gangs at school. Students from families with incomes below $30,000 a year were more likely to have a gang presence in their schools than were students from families with higher annual incomes.

Of central city, suburban and nonmetropolitan area schools, a greater proportion of central city students (25 percent) indicated the presence of gangs at their schools than suburban (14 percent) or nonmetropolitan students (8 percent).

It should be noted that drugs were more available at schools with a gang presence than at schools where gangs are not a problem. Seventy-eight percent of students at schools with gangs reported that a person could obtain drugs at school, compared to 66 percent of students at schools without gangs.

■ Fear of Crime at School

Individuals who have been victims of violent crimes were significantly more likely than nonvictims to indicate that they were afraid of being attacked at school. The vast proportion of students who had not been victims of a violent crime indicated that they were not fearful of attack, either at school (81 percent) or on the way to and from school (87 percent).

Students who had experienced violent crime during the previous six months were more likely to avoid certain places at school out of fear of attack than those students who had experienced property victimization.

Approximately equal percentages of male and female students were fearful of attack at school and avoided certain places. Similarly, approximately equal percentages of Black students, White students, and students of other races reported being afraid of attack at school and avoided places out of fear.

As students get older their fear of attack at school, going to and from school, and avoiding dangerous places at school decreases. Students from families that had changed residences twice or more during the previous five years reported being afraid of attack at school more often than students from families that had changed residences once or less. Also, students from families earning between $7,500 and $15,000 were the most likely to be afraid of attacks at school and avoided places due to fear.

Public school students were more likely than students in nonpublic schools to express fear of attack at school. Also, students in public schools were significantly more likely to avoid certain places at school out of fear than nonpublic school students.

In regard to transportation to and from school, students using public transportation were the most fearful of attack, followed by students who walked or took a school bus or car to school. Students who walked and used public transportation to and from school avoided areas outside the school building due to fear of attack.

■ Objects for Self-Protection

Only two percent of students had taken a weapon or object to school for protection at least once during the previous six-month period. Central city students were more likely than students in suburban or non-metropolitan areas to take a weapon or object for protection to school. Male students were slightly more likely than female students to take such objects to school.

■ School Security Measures

Black students were more likely than students of other racial groups to report that their schools took security measures, i.e., teacher monitoring class changes, hall patrols, and visitor sign-in. Hispanic students were more likely than non-Hispanics students to attend schools where halls were patrolled.

Students indicated that violent crime occurred with as much frequency in schools using security measures, i.e., hall monitors and visitor sign-in, as in schools without such measures. Students in schools using hall monitors as a security measure were more likely to fear an attack than those attending schools without monitors.

The survey asked students to respond to what happened to students caught not respecting a teacher, fighting, drunk at school, and/or cutting class. Students reported that being sent to the principal's office was the most frequently used disciplinary action for not respecting a teacher; suspension for fighting; suspension for getting caught drunk at school; and detention and suspension for cutting class.

New York State Data Gathering

Violence in schools interferes with the right of children to a sound education. The lack of a safe learning environment undermines the ability of many students to attain the knowledge and skills to enable them to become productive citizens. Unfortunately, there is little qualitative knowledge of how students and schools in New York State are affected by this problem and what schools are doing about it. Data on the nature and extent of violence in schools are not systematically collected in New York State. The New York State Education Department (SED) does not maintain centralized information on school crime and disciplinary actions, and school districts are not required to report this information to SED. Furthermore, policies and procedures for maintaining records on these incidents and actions vary both within and across most school districts. No mechanism exists to date to determine how many schools have introduced violence-prevention programs, what types of programs have been implemented, and the extent to which they have been effective.

As a result of increased concern about violence in the schools throughout the State, the Education Department, in cooperation with the Division of Criminal Justice Services, have surveyed all superintendents and a sample of teachers, students, and principals in New York State public schools regarding violent incidents. Results of the survey should be available in winter 1994.

In April 1993, New York State United Teachers (NYSUT) released the results of a survey it conducted on student discipline and school violence — *Conflict in the Classroom*. The survey of presidents of elementary and secondary teacher locals sheds light on the problem. Student profanity, student defiance/disrespect toward teachers, parental disrespect toward teachers, violence directed at students by other students, violence directed at teachers by students, and students carrying weapons in schools (in descending order of frequency) were cited by local presidents as having increased significantly in the last five years.

Factors Associated with School Violence and Vandalism

School Violence

As indicated in Chart 1, seven major categories emerge as associated with school violence: governance, interpersonal communication, leadership, other school-related factors, society and community-related factors, family-related factors, and behavior. The substance of each category is revealed by its defining dimensions. For example, **governance**, as a category of student violence, encompasses the following dimensions — rules and punishment/fairness and firmness in enforcing rules, student government/student control, censorship and racial/ethnic differences.

The following discussion details the seven categories associated with school violence and identifies the defining elements or dimensions for each category, as presented in the research literature (Berger, 1974; National Institute of Education (NIE), 1978; Gaustad, 1990 and 1991; and Kadel and Follman, 1993).

■ Governance

- **Rules and punishment/fairness and firmness in enforcing rules**. Students are not granted the same civil rights as adults within the school. Students perceive that students are not judged against some impartial standard, but are judged against some administrative whim. In addition, students question against what standard teachers and administrators are judged for inappropriate behavior. It appears that students can be removed from school with relative ease, while this is not the case with teachers and administrators (Berger, 1974). Student perception about the absence of fairness in enforcing rules appears to provoke violence (NIE, 1978; Kadel and Follman, 1993). On the other hand, a school principal's firmness in enforcing rules and the amount of control exercised in the classroom are associated with school violence. The more firmly a school is run, the lower the incidence of violence (NIE, 1978). Also, not enforcing rules can encourage school violence (Kadel and Follman, 1993).
- **Student government/student control**. Few students feel that student government is really democratic, where administrators are able, in many cases, to veto student decisions. Some question whether students can learn democratic values within such an authoritarian system (Berger, 1974). Related to the issue of student government is the broader area of student control. Schools in which students feel they have little control over what happens to them have more violence (NIE, 1978).
- **Censorship**. Students complain that teachers and school administrators have a virtual veto over the thrust and content of many of their extracurricular activities. For example, students voiced anger over teachers and administrators exercising control over the choice of assembly speakers and the tone and language in the student press. Although students recognize that such censorship is the result of parental or community pressure, they still hold schools responsible for the restrictions on these freedoms (Berger, 1974).
- **Racial/ethnic differences**. In urban areas, where most of the school violence occurs, a large number of schools in which the majority of the population is minority, are administered and staffed by middle-class White adults. Violence may result from a situation where students, teachers, and administrators have differing values (Berger, 1974).

■ Interpersonal Communication

- **Foreign language and English dialect problems**. Students whose native language is other than English and students who speak English with a vocabulary and sentence structure other than standard American English may have difficulty keeping up with students who speak standard American English as well as understanding school rules and procedures. Without effective bilingual and English language programs these students may have problems competing in class and often violate school rules which they do not under-

stand, leading to frustration, violence, and dropping out of school (Berger, 1974).

- **Diversity and individual dignity**. Students perceive that they are often judged and categorized by teachers and administrators on what they wear and how they speak, rather than on their accomplishments. Not recognizing the diversity and individual dignity of students may lead to student unrest and violence. Also, the current societal stress on youth with its attendant shibboleths may have widened the chasm between students and teachers and administrators (Berger, 1974).
- **Teacher involvement**. Teacher contracts have increasingly released teachers from nonacademic activities, with the purpose of focusing on student results. However, this serves to limit student-teacher interaction in most extracurricular activities. By limiting such interaction, the ability of teachers to counter violence is also limited (Berger, 1974).

■ Leadership

- **Loss of power**. Disciplinary action against teachers or students must now, in many cases, involve union representatives and lawyers. The fear or threat of violence is often manipulated to accelerate administrative or curricular change. Also, while respecting student civil rights may be a deterrent to violence, it, at the same time, impedes administrative reaction to potentially violent situations (Berger, 1974).
- **Curriculum relevance**. Schools have become the primary "acculturating" institution in today's society. Not creating better linkages between students and the world-of-work through relevant academic courses, can turn students off which may be expressed in violent behavior (Berger, 1974; NIE, 1978).
- **Student apathy**. Students who do not clearly understand why they are attending school may become apathetic. Apathetic students are more likely to cause trouble or engage in violent behavior (Berger, 1974).
- **Few minority group teachers and administrators**. The lack of minority group participation in positions of authority, denies many urban students role models on which to pattern responsible school behavior (Berger, 1974).
- **Reluctance to acknowledge problem**. Many school districts are unwilling to acknowledge the problem of violence because they consider bullying, student intimidation of other students, fighting, etc., to be manifestations of normal adolescent behavior (Gaustad, 1991).
- **Training in violence control.** Teachers and administrators lacking training in violence control may have difficulty in controlling violent situations (Kadel and Follman, 1993).

■ Other School-related Factors

- **Proportion of male students**. Since males commit more violent offenses than do females, schools with higher proportions of males have more violence (NIE, 1978).
- **Grade and age levels of students in secondary schools**. The lower the grade level and the younger the students, the more violence in the schools (NIE, 1978).
- **School size**. The larger the school, the greater the risk of violence; the association is not strong (NIE, 1978). School overcrowding causes conditions leading to violence, i.e., more physical contact, feelings of anonymity, and less control over false rumors (Kadel and Follman, 1993).
- **Class size**. Overcrowded classes are less personal for students and translate into less teacher control (Kadel and Follman, 1993). The implication is not only that teachers have better control over smaller classes, but that more continuous contact with the same students helps reduce violence (NIE, 1978).
- **Grades**. Schools where students strive to get good grades have less violence (NIE, 1978).
- **Mandatory school attendance**. Students who do not wish to attend school may be a contributing factor to school violence (Kadel and Follman, 1993).

■ Society and Community-related Factors

- **Crime rate and the presence of fighting gangs in the schools' attendance areas**. It appears that the more crime and violence students are exposed to outside of school, the greater the violence in the school (NIE, 1978).
- **Availability of weapons**. According to the Center to Prevent Handgun Violence, for every household in the United States, two guns are owned by private citizens (Gaustad, 1991; Kadel and Follman, 1993).
- **Increased gang violence and drug trafficking**. Disputes over gang "turf" and drug territories often seep into schools. Weapons which are financed by drug money find their way into the hands of students (Gaustad, 1991; Kadel and Follman, 1993).

- **Hate crimes**. Increasingly young people are committing violence against others based on the other person's real or perceived race, ethnicity, religion, or sexual orientation (Kadel and Follman, 1993).
- **Cycle of disadvantage**. Poverty may be a major determinant whether an individual participates in or is a victim of violence (Kadel and Follman, 1993).
- **Media**. The prevalence or glamorization of violence on film, on television, and in other media may influence young people to commit acts of violence (Kadel and Follman, 1993).
- **Sexual misconduct/battery**. Young women are increasingly becoming the victims of rape, including date rape (Kadel and Follman, 1993).

■ Family-related Factors

- **Erosion of family influence**. The influence of the family, as the primary source of traditional values for children, has eroded in the last 25 years (Kadel and Follman, 1993).
- **Single parent families**. With the growth of single-parent families, many children are deprived of adult role models, especially male role models (Kadel and Follman, 1993).
- **Unsupervised children**. Even in two-parent households, both parents may work leaving their children to face violence on a daily basis which is endemic to many urban neighborhoods. Many of these children turn to violence to survive (Kadel and Follman, 1993).

■ Behavior

- **Aggressiveness**. Chronic personality disorders, undetected learning disabilities and bullying behavior may cause student violence and should be diagnosed and addressed as early as possible (Kadel and Follman, 1993).

Chart 1

COMPARISON OF FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH SCHOOL VIOLENCE

	Berger (1974)	**NIE Study** (1978)	**Gaustad** (1990 and 1991)	**Kadel and Follman** (1993)
Governance	• Rules and punishment • Student government • Censorship • Racial/ethnic differences	• Fairness and firmness in enforcing rules • Student control		• Rules and fairness
Interpersonal Communication	• Foreign language and English dialect problems • Diversity and individual dignity • Teacher involvement			
Leadership	• Loss of power • Curriculum relevance • Student apathy • Few minority group teachers and administrators	• Curriculum relevance	• Reluctance to acknowledge problem	• Training in violence control
Other School-related Factors		• Proportion of male students • Grade and age levels of students in secondary schools • School size • Class size • Grades		• School size • Class size • Mandating school attendance
Society and Community-related Factors		• Crime rate & fighting gangs	• Availability of weapons • Increased gang violence and drug trafficking	• Availability of weapons • Gang violence • Drug/alcohol abuse • Hate crimes • Cycle of disadvantage • Media • Sexual misconduct/battery
Family-related Factors				• Erosion of family influence • Single parent families • Unsupervised children
Behavior				• Aggressiveness

School Vandalism

Twelve factors are associated with vandalism in schools: crime rate, residential concentration, presence of nonstudent youth, family intactness and discipline, school size, rule enforcement, classroom control and nonclassroom supervision, coordination between faculty and administration, exhibition of student frustrations, valuing teacher opinions, manipulation of grades, competition of grades, and student leadership status. The following discussion identifies and defines each school vandalism factor (National Institute of Education, 1978).

- **Crime rate**. Crime in the school attendance area.
- **Residential concentration**. The proximity of the school to students' homes may make it a convenient target for vandalism.
- **Presence of nonstudent youth**. Nonstudent youth around the school increase the school's risk of property loss.
- **Family intactness and discipline**. Schools having higher proportions of students from families in which both parents are present, and in which discipline is firm, suffer less property loss due to vandalism and other offenses.
- **School size.** In larger schools, where there is more to steal or destroy, property losses will be higher.
- **Rule enforcement, classroom control, and nonclassroom supervision**. The more firmly a school is run, the fewer offenses it has.
- **Coordination between faculty and administration**. Effective coordination between faculty and administration is a significant factor in the smooth operation of schools.
- **Exhibition of student frustrations**. As a response to hostile and authoritarian attitudes on the part of teachers toward students, students apparently exhibit their frustrations on the school.
- **Valuing teachers' opinions**. Schools in which students identify with their teachers and value teachers' opinions of them have less vandalism.
- **Manipulation of grades**. The manipulation of grades as a disciplinary practice may be seen by students as arbitrary and unfair, with the result that the school is the victim.
- **Competition for grades**. Schools where students strive to get good grades have more vandalism than other schools, often caused by students who do not do as well as others.
- **Student leadership status**. Schools where there is intense competition for leadership among students have greater property loss.

Strategies to Reduce Violence in Schools

Prevention Strategies

As indicated in Chart 2, school violence prevention strategies cluster within 20 major categories: written policies and planning, staff training, instruction, record keeping, curriculum development and instruction, teacher safety and actions, school administrative leadership, counseling, early childhood programs, special education, security measures, victim orientation, school district responsibility, school environment, community, parent and student involvement, student achievement and rewards, discipline, legislation, governance, interpersonal communication, and other factors, e.g., graffiti removal. The following discussion details the 20 school violence prevention strategies and identifies the defining elements or dimensions for each strategy, as presented in the research literature (Berger, 1974; National Institute of Education (NIE), 1978; Kean, 1981; Bullock, Reilly and Donahue, 1983; National School Safety Center (NSSC), 1986; United Federation of Teachers (UFT), 1990; Quarles, 1989; National School Safety Center (NSSC), 1989; Hranitz and Eddowes, 1990; Gaustad, 1990 and 1991; Mole, 1991; New York State United Teachers (NYSUT), 1993; and Kadel and Follman, 1993).

■ Written Policies and Planning

- **Clear school guidelines and policies**. Student guidelines should be developed, distributed, and understood by all involved, students, teachers, administrators, parents, and community members (Bullock et al., 1983; Quarles, 1989; Mole, 1991; Kadel and Follman, 1993). Such guidelines or policies should be clear that assaults or violence in the school will be treated as a crime, and the school will work with local authorities in prosecuting the offender (NSSC, 1986). Not only should school guidelines be clear and consistent, but they must be enforced fairly and firmly (Gaustad, 1990). Schools should establish clear and consistent rules for discipline and the consequences for violating them (NYSUT, 1993).
- **Discipline codes**. Student discipline and suspension regulations, at all levels, should be reviewed and revised as appropriate (UFT, 1990).
- **Plan reaction to violence**. School staff should plan their reaction to violent actions with the awareness that physical resistance to violence usually requires medical treatment (Quarles, 1989).

■ Staff Training and Instruction

- **Pre- and in-service training**. A school's safety program must address the training needs of teachers and other school staff (Kadel and Follman, 1993). For teachers in schools with serious problems of crime and disruption, intensive training in classroom management can increase their skills (NIE, 1978; Mole, 1991). Preservice, in-service, and on-site follow-up training should be established focusing on effective management techniques for school populations exhibiting violent behavior. In addition, teachers must have training in understanding the belief systems of the students they teach (Bullock et al., 1983). Such training should include procedures and techniques for positive interaction with nonconforming students. Crime prevention and deterrence should be top priorities for such in-service activities (Quarles, 1989).
- **Workshops and seminars to control anger**. Workshops and seminars should be offered to teachers on how to behave in explosive situations conducted by both school and other personnel, i.e., law enforcement officials, human relations managers, and medical personnel (NSSC, 1986).
- **Assertiveness training**. Assertiveness training should assist school staff to learn how to voice opinions and beliefs in a nonaggressive, positive manner (NSSC, 1986).
- **Staff training in the prevention of and protection from violence**. Teachers and other staff should be assisted in preventing violence and protecting themselves against violent behavior (NYSUT, 1993).

■ Record Keeping

- **Reporting serious problems to police**. School districts confronted with serious incidents of violence

and vandalism should review current procedures for reporting crimes to the police and other appropriate agencies. Also, record keeping procedures should be established and maintained (NIE, 1978).

- **Mandatory and uniform reporting of school violence**. Regulations should be promulgated at the Federal and/or state level requiring school districts to collect information on crime and violence (NYSUT, 1993).

■ Curriculum Development and Instruction

- **Relevant courses for "turned-off" students**. The perceived lack of relevance of courses is associated with student apathy and violence. Alternative school programs is one approach in addressing the problem (NIE, 1978).
- **Law-related educational curricula**. Curricula should be developed that explain the basis for the American democratic system, including its legal, legislative, and educational institutions, and create support for the principles and processes upon which they are based (NSSC, 1986).
- **Assertiveness training**. Assertiveness training to assist school staff to learn how to voice opinions and beliefs in a nonaggressive, positive manner (NSSC, 1986).
- **Violence-prevention curricula**. Violence-prevention curricula (developed and tested in the Boston Youth Program) are designed to address homicide and violence among youth by helping them understand and deal with anger and violence (NSSC, 1989).
- **Conflict resolution curricula and programs**. Conflict resolution curricula (developed by the Community Board Center for Policy and Training, San Francisco, California) are designed to assist secondary school students incorporate conflict-resolution methods in "their own lives — at school, at home and in the community" (NSSC, 1989; Gaustad, 1990). Train teachers and other school personnel to help themselves and their students find nonviolent ways to resolve problems (NYSUT, 1993; Kadel and Follman, 1993).
- **Firearms instruction**. Firearms classes (developed by the National Rifle Association) provide instruction on the safe handling of firearms by youth (NSSC, 1989).
- **Gang prevention curricula**. Gang prevention curricula are designed to change attitudes toward gangs with the object of reaching younger students before gangs do (Gaustad, 1991).
- **Antiviolence curricula**. Antiviolence curricula and classes are designed for high school students, usually gang members, suspended for fighting, assault, weapons violations, or gang violence before they can return to their regular schools (Gaustad, 1991).
- **Personal skills development**. Curriculum should be developed that integrates personal skills that students will use for school and for life, e.g., cooperation, fair play, good judgment, self-esteem, responsibility, integrity, and honesty (NYSUT, 1993).
- **Character education**. Fostering values in students to help them to interact with others in a positive nonviolent manner, to abide by laws and to accept other cultures (Kadel and Follman, 1993).

■ Teacher Safety and Actions

Teacher Safety

- **Teaching staff in problem schools**. Classrooms are the safest places for students in schools, with smaller classes associated with a decrease in crime and vandalism. An approach to decreasing violence would be to increase the number of teachers at problem schools, thereby decreasing class size (NIE, 1978).
- **Relationships among members of the school system**. Support from the Board of Education and administrators to teachers, and among teachers, is important to producing a safe school environment. Also, support from parents and the community helps in establishing and maintaining a safe school environment (NIE, 1978).
- **Safe working conditions**. Teachers should have safe working conditions, and neither teachers nor students should be allowed to remain on the school campus before or after working hours if their safety cannot be ensured (NEA, 1989).

Teacher Actions

- **Positive attention**. Ignoring a student's inappropriate behavior may result in a desired behavior change (Bullock et al., 1983).
- **Physical cuing**. Use of facial expressions, gestures, and body language by teachers reinforces appropriate students behaviors and indicates disapproval for inappropriate ones (Bullock et al., 1983).
- **"Third eye."** Teachers should manage the physical classroom situation to allow for optimal obser-

vation of students, thereby short-circuiting disruptive behavior (Bullock et al., 1983).

- **Physical proximity**. Classroom management technique that takes teachers from behind their desks and places them closer to students and helps teachers anticipate disruptive or inappropriate behaviors (Bullock et al., 1983).
- **Skipping stones**. Providing individual attention to a student having difficulty with work or comprehending directions, may help the student overcome or "skip over" a potentially disruptive behavior (Bullock et al., 1983).
- **Teacher interest**. To avoid student boredom and the potential for disruptive behavior in relation to a specific activity, the teacher should express interest in the activity or use positive verbal cues as motivators to students (Bullock et al., 1983).
- **Stimulus reduction**. In the case of those students having difficulty with certain kinds of classroom stimuli, teachers may have to eliminate or reduce objects from the classroom that could be the cause of distraction, e.g., bulletin boards, globes, etc. (Bullock et al., 1983).
- **Creative teaching**. Repetitive classroom activities causing boredom should be reduced to the greatest extent possible in order to avoid the potential for disruptive behavior (Bullock et al., 1983).
- **Positive time out**. In those situations where the teacher is able to exert control over a student who is becoming a threat to himself/herself or others, the teacher should try to maneuver the student to an isolated area where the student can regain composure (Bullock et al., 1983).

■ School Administrative Leadership

- **Responsiveness to the needs of students and faculty**. Changes are called for at the state educational department and local education agency levels related to the "structure and nature of the administrative process," i.e., greater flexibility in the course of study, expanded use of work-study opportunities, greater parent involvement, etc. (Berger, 1974).
- **Role of principals**. Schools affected by violence should have principals with excellent leadership abilities who are able to create a positive school climate. This may mean that the school may have to be provided with assistance for routine tasks, thereby allowing the principal more time to interact with students and teachers, walk the halls and grounds, visit classrooms and meet with formal and informal student leaders to discuss student and school activities (NIE, 1978; Kadel and Follman, 1993). Graduate schools should provide opportunities for students in educational administration to work with and observe the administrative styles of successful principals (NIE, 1978).

■ Counseling

- **Peer-tutoring corps**. Selected secondary students, trained by local law enforcement authorities, can assist teachers and school administrators in giving speeches on crime and crime-prevention (NSSC, 1986).
- **Peer counseling/conflict management**. Peer counselors are student volunteers who are trained to be mediators by working with other students in conflict resolution and problem-solving situations (NSSC, 1989; Gaustad, 1991). Peer interactions, i.e., peer mentoring, peer mediation, and guided group discussion, serve as a safe outlet for students to resolve problems and overcome frustrations (Kadel and Follman, 1993).
- **Counseling services in schools**. Psychological counseling in schools should be expanded through additional school counselors, school social workers, and school psychologists (NYSUT, 1993).

■ Early Childhood Programs

- **Linkages to early elementary grades**. To circumvent gang influence, violence prevention program must begin in the early elementary grades focusing on students who display indications of gang involvement, e.g., gang-identified colors or dress, sudden unexplained show of having money and behavioral changes (Gaustad, 1990).

■ Special Education

- **Special education disciplinary policies and staffing**. Disciplinary regulations for special education should be revised as a result of court decisions which do not allow suspension or expulsion for acts "in the scope of handicapping conditions." Also, staffing of some special education programs should be reviewed in terms of employing staff trained in restraining individuals exhibiting violent behavior (UFT, 1990).

■ Security Measures

- **Security personnel and procedures**. Security personnel can be helpful in decreasing violence and property loss, but it is not a substitute for effective governance. The recruitment and training of such personnel should emphasize interpersonal skills as well as security functions. In many cases security personnel serve as counselors and peacekeepers, and should be hired with these roles in mind (NIE, 1978; Quarles, 1989). School officials should consider recruiting security personnel from the school neighborhood, because they may be in a better position to understand student behaviors and problems (Berger, 1974).
- **Security systems**. There are a number of security devices that can be used in schools, many of which are effective in deterring crime and violence, i.e., closed circuit television, card access, and alarm systems (NYSUT, 1993). Schools should seek expert advice and speak to other schools where such equipment is being used before using such equipment (Berger 1974; NIE, 1978).
- **Surveillance and traffic control of problem areas**. Hallways, stairwells, restrooms, classrooms, cafeterias, and locker rooms/gymnasiums are areas in the school where violence is most likely to occur. The better the school administration can control these areas, the better the chances of maintaining order in school (NIE, 1978).
- **Security and safety announcements**. Security and safety announcements should occur on a daily basis *via* the school intercom system and at school assemblies (Quarles, 1989).
- **Responsibility for personal safety**. School staff must understand that personal safety is their responsibility (Quarles, 1989).
- **Group security consciousness**. If learning activities are to advance and progress, students, administrators and staff must understand that security is a common concern (Quarles, 1989).
- **Liaison with local law enforcement**. Local law enforcement officials can assist schools by serving in a liaison capacity within the school, by performing the duties of school security officers, and by class presentations (Mole, 1991; Kadel and Follman, 1993).

■ Victim and/or Assailant Focus

- **Victim witness program**. Student and adult volunteers are trained to be witnesses to violent actions (NSSC, 1986).
- **Victim support program**. Timely and effective assistance should be provided to school staff who are victims of school violence (UFT, 1990).
- **Counseling for victims and assailants**. Schools and districts should have agreements with local psychologists, therapists, counselors, and other experienced professionals to assist in dealing with victims of violence, violent offenders, the grieving process and violence prevention (Kadel and Follman, 1993).

■ School District Responsibility

- **Recognition of violence as a problem**. Progress cannot be made in addressing the problem of violence, until it receives the attention it deserves (NIE, 1978).
- **Problem assessment**. In order to determine the scope and dimension of violence in a particular school, methods and instruments should be designed and developed or replicated that address the problem (NIE, 1978).
- **Priority focus for problem**. Other goals may not be achieved unless violence is given a priority focus. The school administration, backed by the Board of Education, should recognize its importance and provide active support (NIE, 1978).
- **Role of schools**. Schools must recognize that violence prevention programs are important and must be encouraged. Often locally planned and initiated programs are successful in reducing violence (NIE, 1978).
- **Consensus cooperation and resources**. In order for safe school programs to be established and to be effective, there must be agreement among all interested parties in a community — schools, parents, police, social agencies, courts — in their planning and implementation of the programs. Appropriate resources should be devoted to such purposes (NIE, 1978).

■ School Environment

- **Personalization of schools**. School size, student anonymity and alienation appear to foster crime. Large schools should be reorganized into smaller, more manageable units — schools within schools (NYSUT, 1993). Accessibility of the principal and decreased student-teacher ratios tend to personalize large schools (NIE, 1978; NYSUT, 1993). Increased amount of time teachers spend with students has positive effects (NIE, 1978).

- **Humanistic learning environments**. School personnel, students, parents, and community members should work to develop more humanistic learning environments, including mini-schools, alternative schools, and house plans (Kean, 1981).
- **Educational alternatives**. Greater organizational creativity should be infused into schooling, including work-study programs, modular scheduling, etc. (Kean, 1981).
- **Positive school climate**. Students should attend schools where they feel reasonably safe and need not bring weapons to school for protection. To reinforce this approach, a California school asks students and their parents to sign a contract of nonviolence (NSSC, 1989). A school with a climate where students, school staff and parents feel welcome and safe, may be more successful in helping victims of violence work through the healing process (Kadel and Follman, 1993).
- **Recreational alternatives**. Schools should offer recreational alternatives to gang activity and after-school violence-prone situations by staying open in the evening (Gaustad, 1990).
- **Organizational development approach**. The organizational development approach focuses on improving the school's problem-solving and planning capacities by improving communication and cooperation among all levels of the school organization (Mole, 1991).
- **Physical environment**. The more schools resemble conference centers, libraries, and other facilities with positive physical environments and less like penal institutions, the better the learning environment (Kadel and Follman, 1993).

■ Community, Parent, and Student Involvement

- **Parental involvement**. Parents should be involved in all aspects of their children's education. Through improved parental involvement in the school, parents would be able to reinforce school rules and regulations at home (Berger, 1974). Also, school districts should offer programs to help parents improve their parenting skills (NYSUT, 1993), and to provide parents with the skills to raise nonviolent children (Kadel and Follman, 1993).
- **Coordination with local courts**. Schools and local courts should work together to plan their activities in respect to juvenile offenders (NIE, 1978).
- **Liaison with outside agencies**. Community health agencies should be used to identify high-risk early signs of behavioral problems (Kean, 1981).
- **Adults on campus**. Having adults visibly on the school campus in various capacities demonstrates to students that school rules will be enforced (NSSC, 1986).
- **Buddy system**. A coordinated system of victim support should be established which allows a victim of violence to be escorted by other students when passing through high-risk parts of the school campus (NSSC, 1986).
- **Delinquency Prevention Committee/Task Force**. A delinquency prevention committee/task force should be established involving community members, educators, and students to address community-wide delinquency prevention issues (NSSC, 1986).
- **Safe corridor program**. Community members, school personnel, and law enforcement authorities should identify safe paths between school and home and assist students, as needed, between both locations (NSSC, 1986).
- **Activities for adolescents**. Schools and communities should encourage and provide students opportunities to improve their schools and communities, e.g., building playgrounds and gardens, distributing food and other necessities to the needy, and serving as mentors for young students in reading and other subjects (Hranitz and Eddowes, 1990).
- **Collaborative efforts**. Multidisciplinary task forces should be established at the local level, composed of representatives of the city council, board of education, business, local religious, social, health and welfare agencies, juvenile and legal systems, medical practitioners, and parks and recreation departments, to meet regularly to discuss violence and associated family conditions (Hranitz and Eddowes, 1990; Kadel and Follman, 1993). State departments of education, health and human resources may also be involved in providing technical assistance, materials, and financial assistance (Kadel and Follman, 1993). Other collaborative efforts could include, for example, schools working with these organizations in providing jobs or job-related activities for high-risk students (Gaustad, 1991), developing resource guides of community services and guidelines for the employment of security guards, youth activities for the summer and linkages to early childhood education programs (Kadel and Follman, 1993).

- **Support systems for young families**. Schools should provide support for young families by funding Head Start, day care for children of working or student parents and after school care (Hranitz and Eddowes, 1990).
- **Interaction with caring adults**. Concern shown for troubled youth by teachers, police officers, and other community members has, in some cases, turned them away from violence and gang crime to lawful activities and productive lives (Gaustad, 1991).
- **Community involvement**. The actual and potential economic problems for communities resulting from school violence may enlist community support for a range of school efforts to prevent violent incidents (Kadel and Follman, 1993).
- **School and community service projects**. Students perform services for their school or community through activities ranging from working in the school library to helping an elderly person shop. Some states and school systems blend community service into their curricula, e.g., community service is part of the graduation requirements in the state of Maryland and Atlanta, Georgia (Kadel and Follman, 1993).

■ Student Achievement and Rewards

- **Incentives for efforts and achievements**. A structure of incentives, e.g., grades and honors, should be established which rewards students for their efforts and achievements. Diverse kinds of accomplishments should be rewarded, including individual improvement, and make rewards available to more students (NIE, 1978).
- **Skills attainment beyond the 3Rs**. Schools need to teach responsible citizenship, effective decision making, conflict resolution, cooperation, and simple courtesy — emphasizing that there are acceptable and law-abiding ways for students to deal with problems (Hranitz and Eddowes, 1990).

■ Discipline

- **Systematic discipline**. Firm, fair, and consistent application of discipline is associated with lower levels of violence (NIE, 1978).
- **Repressive discipline procedures**. Repressive discipline procedures, particularly corporal punishment, should be eliminated from the school setting (Berger, 1974; Kean, 1981).
- **Existing discipline procedures**. New methods for disciplining students should be explored that avoid placing parents and schools in adversarial positions, and allow school officials to provide students environments free from violent behavior (NYSUT, 1993).

■ Legislation

- **Trespass laws**. Strengthened trespass laws can decrease criminal activity around the school campus, i.e., extortion, assault, and drug trafficking (Berger, 1974).
- **Safe schools**. Legislation should be enacted in states throughout the Nation which acknowledges the right of each student to attend a safe school (NSSC, 1986).
- **Firearms and parental responsibility**. Parents should be required to store firearms safely in their homes, and should be held legally responsible for the irresponsible storage of such firearms (NSSC, 1989).
- **The family**. Federal and state legislation should be enacted which strengthens families by encouraging them to stay together, e.g., training opportunities for families with a father living in the home (Hranitz and Eddowes, 1990).

■ Governance

- **Role and power of student government**. Meaningful involvement of students in the governance of the school, making their views known through democratic processes, may decrease the incidence of violence on persons and school property (Berger, 1974).
- **Student participation in decision making**. Students should be more involved than they are in the decision-making process, particularly in regard to school safety and discipline procedures (Kean, 1981; Mole, 1991; Kadel and Follman, 1993).

■ Interpersonal Communications

- **Manageable schools**. Schools should be divided into smaller manageable clusters, where students are less shielded by other students and are more compelled to resolve conflicts (Berger, 1974).
- **Teacher noninstructional duties**. Teachers may experience more successful interactions with stu-

dents if they expand their interactions to noninstructional duties, e.g., cafeteria, hall, or yard duty (Berger, 1974).

- **Student, teacher, and administrator actions**. Students, teachers, and administrators should become more aware of each other's wants and needs, including the expression of needs and problems in a nonthreatening, nonviolent manner (Berger, 1974).
- **Student-teacher contact**. Teacher-student contact outside the classroom should be increased (Kean, 1981).

■ Other Factors

- **Graffiti**. Graffiti should be removed immediately from the school campus. Gang-associated graffiti could lead to a rival gang defacing the other's symbols which could result in violence (Gaustad, 1990).
- **Serious offenders**. School districts should be given the resources to develop academic-based alternative programs for chronic problem students which meet the requirements of state law to educate all students while removing them from situations where they negatively influence or harm other students (NYSUT, 1993).

Chart 2

COMPARISON OF PREVENTION STRATEGIES

PREVENTION STRATEGIES	Berger (1974)	NIE Study (1978)	Kean (1981)	Bullock et al. (1983)	NSSC (1986)	Quarles (1989)
Written Policies and Planning				• Discipline codes	• **Clear school policies**	• Written policy • Plan reaction to violence
Staff Training and Instruction		• Pre- and in-service training		• Preservice, in-service and on-site follow-up	• **Educator in-service training** • **Workshops and seminars to control anger** • **Assertiveness training**	• In-service and instruction for administrators and staff
Record Keeping		• Reporting serious problems to police				
Curriculum Development and Instruction		• Relevant courses for "turned off" students			• **Law-related education curricula** • **Assertiveness training**	
Teacher Safety and Actions		• Teaching staff in problem schools • Relationships among members of school system		• Positive attention • Physical cuing • "Third Eye" • Physical proximity • Skipping stones • Teacher interest • Stimulus reduction • Creative teaching • Positive time out		• Safe working conditions
School Administrative Leadership	• **Responsiveness to the needs of students and faculty**	• Role of principals				

NSSC (1989)	UFT (1990)	Hranitz and Eddowes (1990)	Gaustad (1990 and 1991)	Mole (1991)	NYSUT (1993)	Kadel and Follman (1993)
	• Discipline codes		• Clear school policies	• **Clear rules and procedures**	• Clear standards of discipline	• **Code of conduct**
				• **In-service on classroom management**	• Staff training in prevention of and protection from violence	• **Staff workshops, seminars and peer observation**
					• Mandatory and uniform reporting of school violence	
• **Violence-prevention curricula** • **Conflict resolution curricula** • **Firearms instruction**			• Conflict resolution curricula • Gang prevention curricula • Antiviolence curricula		• Personal skills development • Conflict resolution program	• **Character education** • **Conflict resolution**
						• **Role of principals**

CHART 2: COMPARISON OF PREVENTION STRATEGIES (continued)

	Berger (1974)	NIE Study (1978)	Kean (1981)	Bullock et al. (1983)	NSSC (1986)	Quarles (1989)
Counseling					• Peer tutoring corps	
Early Childhood Programs						
Special Education						
Security Measures	• Security guards • Security systems	• Security personnel and procedures • Surveillance and control of problem areas • Security systems				• Security and safety announcements • Responsibility for personal safety • Security personnel • Group security consciousness
Victim and/or Assailant Focus					• Victim witness program	
School District Responsibility		• Recognition of violence as a problem • Problem assessment • Priority focus for problem • Role of schools • Consensus cooperation and resources				
School Environment		• Personalization of schools	• Humanistic learning environments • Educational alternatives			

NSSC (1989)	UFT (1990)	Hranitz and Eddowes (1990)	Gaustad (1990 and 1991)	Mole (1991)	NYSUT (1993)	Kadel and Follman (1993)
• Peer counseling			• Peer conflict management		• Counseling service in schools	• Peer mentoring, peer mediation, and guided group discussions
			• Linkage to early elementary grades			
	• Special education disciplinary policies and staffing					
				• Liaison with local law enforcement	• Security systems	• Liaison with local law enforcement
	• Victim support program					• Counseling for victims and assailants
• Positive school climate			• Recreational alternatives	• Organizational development approach	• Personalization of schools	• Positive school climate • Physical environment

CHART 2: COMPARISON OF PREVENTION STRATEGIES (continued)

	Berger (1974)	NIE Study (1978)	Kean (1981)	Bullock et al. (1983)	NSSC (1986)	Quarles (1989)
Community, Parent, and Student Involvement	• Parental involvement	• Coordination with local courts	• Liaison with outside agencies	• Liaison with outside agencies	• Adults on campus • Buddy system • Delinquency Prevention Committee and Task Force • Safe corridor program	
Student Achievement and Rewards		• Incentives for efforts and achievements				
Discipline		• Systematic discipline	• Repressive discipline procedures			
Legislation	• Trespass laws				• Safe schools	
Governance	• Role and power of student government		• Student participation in decision making			
Interpersonal Communications	• Manageable schools • Teacher non-instructional duties • Student, teacher, and administrator actions		• Student-teacher contact			
Other						

NSSC (1989)	UFT (1990)	Hranitz and Eddowes (1990)	Gaustad (1990 and 1991)	Mole (1991)	NYSUT (1993)	Kadel and Follman (1993)
		• Activities for adolescents • Collaborative efforts • Support systems for young families	• Collaborative efforts • Interaction with caring adults		• Parental involvement	• School and community service projects • Parental and community involvement • Collaborative efforts
		• Skills attainment beyond the 3Rs				
					• Existing discipline procedures	
• Firearms and parental responsibility		• The family				
						• Student participation in decision making
			• Graffiti		• Serious offenders	

Intervention Strategies

Intervention strategies represent more immediate responses to reduce or eliminate violence in schools. Chart 3 and the following discussion detail seven intervention strategies — staff in-service, negotiations, communications, community, parent, and student involvement, school site administrative responsibility, crisis management plan, and school access and building control — and identify the defining elements or dimensions for each strategy, as presented in the research literature (National School Safety Center, 1986 and 1989; and Kadel and Follman, 1993).

■ Staff In-service

- **Teacher in-service training**. Teachers should be trained to understand how to stop a fight from mushrooming into an assault (National School Safety Center, 1986 and 1989).
- **School safety plans**. School staff should be updated on a regular basis on school safety plans (NSSC, 1989).

■ Negotiations

- **Arbitration and mediation**. Teams of school personnel, law enforcement authorities, and community members should be established to provide arbitration and mediation services to violence-prone students and groups, in addition to potential victims of violent actions (NSSC, 1986).

■ Communications

- **Community newsletter**. A newsletter should be distributed, on a regular basis, to help keep students, parents, school personnel, community members, and other interested individuals abreast of school and community activities related to school violence (NSSC, 1986).
- **Linking classrooms with other parts of building**. A communications network should link classroom and schoolyard supervisors with the principal and building security staff offices and with law enforcement and fire departments (NSSC, 1989).
- **Effective communications network**. Students, faculty and staff, and parents of students should be kept informed during a crisis situation to prevent it from becoming more explosive and to discourage rumors (Kadel and Follman, 1993).

■ Community, Parent, and Student Involvement

- **School safety committee**. School security procedures and policies should be reviewed and revised regularly by a committee composed of students, parents, school personnel, law enforcement officials, and other youth service providers, and community members (NSSC, 1989).
- **School campus supervision**. Patrols, comprising community volunteers and parents, should be established to supervise the schools' grounds, especially before and after school (NSSC, 1989).
- **Students reporting unusual occurrences**. Students should be encouraged by the school administration to report suspicious individuals on the school grounds (NSSC, 1989).

■ School Site Administrative Responsibility

- **School site responsibility**. School administrative staff should understand the student population and the problems facing them and the school and work closely with the school board and district staff in implementing security procedures (NSSC, 1989).

■ Crisis Management Plan

- **Community agency resources**. All appropriate community resources should be used to plan for and intervene with students, immediately following a crisis situation (NSSC, 1989).
- **Crisis management plan**. Designed by a school team composed of teachers, administrators, students, counselors, bus drivers, security personnel, and other staff in addition to representatives from the school district office, law enforcement, and health services, the plan identifies all necessary tasks for handling a violent situation by assigning staff members and backups to be responsible for specific tasks (Kadel and Follman, 1993).

■ School Access and Building Control

- **Limiting access points into school**. Access points to schools should be closely monitored — establishment of single visitor entrance with receptionist or security guard; visitors must identify themselves, sign in at entrance receptionist desk and wear an identification pass; and entrances used by vendors should be monitored on a regular basis (NSSC, 1989).

Chart 3

COMPARISON OF INTERVENTION STRATEGIES

INTERVENTION STRATEGIES	NSSC (1986)	NSSC (1989)	Kadel and Follman (1993)
Staff In-service	• Teacher in-service training	• School safety plans	
Negotiations	• Arbitration & mediation		
Communications	• Community newsletter	• Linking classroom with other parts of building	
Community, Parent, and Student Involvement		• School security committee • School campus supervision • Students reporting unusual occurrences	• Effective communications network
School Site Administrative Responsibility	• School site responsibility		
Crisis Management Plan		• Community agency resources	• Crisis management plan
School Access		• Access points into school	

Response Strategies

Response strategies represent immediate actions to address a violent situation, to punish offenders, to assist the victims of violence, and to provide follow-up programs and services. The following discussion details 13 major response strategies — immediate arrest, immediate media contact, interagency team for crises referrals, safe schools/internal affairs department, youth reentry program, victimization adjustment classes, school board policies, retraining alternatives, schedule adjustments, advocate for sexual assault victims, violent incident reports, violent incident response, and less violent incident response — and identifies defining elements or dimensions for each strategy, as presented in the research literature (National School Safety Center, 1986; and Kadel and Follman, 1993).

- **Immediate Arrest**. Any perpetrator should be arrested immediately, and a brief explanation of the facts should be presented to the student body, school personnel, and other concerned/interested parties (NSSC, 1986).
- **Immediate Media Contact**. In order to ensure accurate reporting of an incident, the principal should contact a local reporter known for accurate and fair reporting, as soon as possible (NSSC, 1986; Kadel and Follman, 1993).
- **Interagency Team for Crises Referrals**. A team, composed of school personnel, law enforcement authorities, and health professionals, should provide referral services for victims and offenders (NSSC, 1986).
- **Safe Schools/Internal Affairs Department**. School districts should establish safe schools/internal affairs units focusing on making schools violence-free and conducive learning environments by helping school officials in investigating serious crimes, instructing students and school personnel in crime and violence prevention, and in coordinating district violence prevention activities with law enforcement and other agencies (NSSC, 1986).
- **Youth Reentry Program**. Students who are incarcerated as a result of violent crime should be enrolled in a program that encompasses vocational and psychological components, and such

specialized assistance should be continued when he/she returns to the school district. Also, school personnel should work with the courts in establishing the parameters for the student's probation (NSSC, 1986).

- **Victimization Adjustment Classes**. Specialized assistance should be offered to victims of violence, i.e., students, family members, and school personnel, on how to deal with their victimization, including classes on medical treatment, emotional support, financial help, and legal assistance (NSSC, 1986). School staff should be knowledgeable about the needs of victims of violence (Kadel and Follman, 1993).
- **School Board Policies**. School board policies should guarantee the safety of school personnel from physical attacks and property loss and should make reimbursement, when necessary (NSSC, 1986).
- **Retraining Alternatives**. Schools districts should provide reimbursement for retraining school personnel who are victims of violent crimes, including training for new professions or transfers to other positions in the school district (NSSC, 1986).
- **Schedule Adjustments**. When the perpetrator of the violent act returns to school, contact between the perpetrator and the victim should be eliminated or kept to an absolute minimum; school personnel should monitor the safety of the victim (NSSC, 1986).
- **Advocate for Sexual Assault Victims**. School should assign an advocate for victims of sexual assault who is the same sex as the victim and is able to explain to the victim his/her rights and to assist the victim through administrative and criminal proceedings (Kadel and Follman, 1993).
- **Violent Incident Reports**. Acknowledging crime and reporting is essential to understanding the scope of the problem and devising strategies to address it (Kadel and Follman, 1993).
- **Violent Incident Response**. Out-of-school suspension (student is removed from school for a specific period of time), in-school suspension (student remains in school, but is removed from his/her class and denied participation in extracurricular activities for a specific period of time) and expulsion (student is removed from school for indefinite period of time) are the most common responses used by schools to discipline a student for violent behavior (Kadel and Follman, 1993).
- **Less Violent Incident Response**. Service assignments (student performing supervised assignments on school grounds instead of out-of-school suspension) and alternative educational programs (schools-within-schools emphasizing independent study, good conduct, and developing self-discipline and responsibility) are two approaches in dealing with violent incidents that are not severe enough to remove a student from school (Kadel and Follman, 1993).

Initiatives to Reduce Violence in Schools

Federal Initiatives

Legislation, proposed by President Clinton, was introduced in the 103rd Congress to decrease violence in schools — the **Safe Schools Act of 1993**. Funds would be directed to local educational agencies for the following activities:

- identifying and assessing school violence and discipline problems, including coordinating needs assessment activities with education, law-enforcement, judicial, health, social services, and other appropriate agencies and organizations
- conducting school safety reviews or violence prevention reviews of programs, policies, practices, and facilities to determine what changes are needed to reduce or prevent violence and promote safety and discipline
- planning comprehensive, long-term strategies for combating and preventing school violence and discipline problems through the involvement and coordination of school programs with other education, law-enforcement, judicial, health, social services, and other appropriate agencies and organizations
- establishing community education programs informing parents, businesses, local government, the media, and other appropriate entities about the local educational agency's plan to promote school safety and reduce and prevent school violence and discipline problems and the need for community support
- coordinating school-based activities designed to promote school safety and reduce or prevent school violence and discipline problems with related efforts of education, law-enforcement, judicial, health, social services, and other appropriate agencies and organizations
- developing and implementing antiviolance activities, including —
  - conflict resolution and social skills development for students, teachers, aides, other school personnel and parents
  - disciplinary alternatives to expulsion and suspension of students who exhibit violent or antisocial behavior
  - student-led activities, such as peer mediation, peer counseling, and student courts
- educating students and parents about the dangers of guns and other weapons and the consequences of their use
- developing and implementing innovative curricula to prevent violence in schools and training staff regarding how to stop disruptive or violent behavior if it occurs
- supporting "safe zones of passage" for students between home and school through such measures as Drug- and Weapons-Free School Zones, enhanced law enforcement, and neighborhood patrols
- counseling programs for victims and witnesses of school violence and crime
- remodeling to promote security and reduce the risk of violence, such as removing lockers, installing better lights, and upgrading lockers
- acquiring and installing metal detectors and hiring security personnel
- reimbursing law enforcement authorities for their personnel who participate in school violence prevention activities

In addition, a bill was reintroduced in the first session of the 103rd Congress by Representative José Serrano, of New York, to provide assistance to local educational agencies for the prevention and reduction of violent crime in schools throughout the Nation. Grants under the proposed legislation could be used to fund anticrime and safety measures and to develop education and training programs for the prevention of crime, violence, and illegal use of drugs and alcohol; for counseling programs for victims and witnesses of crime in schools; to develop programs for conflict resolution and peer mediation counseling for students, teachers, and other personnel in regular contact with students at school; to purchase crime prevention equipment, including metal detectors and video-surveillance devices; and for the prevention and reduction of the

participation of students in organized crime and drug and gang-related activities in schools.

New York State Initiatives

There is concern in New York State that the proliferation of illegal firearms is the cause of much of the violence occurring in the State. In this regard, the State Division of Criminal Justice Services issued **A Strategy for Action Against Gun-Related Violence** in June 1992. The strategy calls for interstate coordination to stop the flow of illegal firearms into the State; stronger enforcement against illegal firearms trafficking; passage of legislation to strengthen penalties for many firearms-related offenses; strict criminal liability for owners of firearms who are negligent in storing their firearms; strenuous regulations and tracking of firearms sales; enhanced firearms safety measures; and the development of prevention, education, and health strategies.

Also, the increased violence in the State's schools compelled Governor Cuomo to request the State Education Department and the State Division of Criminal Justice Services to conduct a statewide study of the nature and extent of violence in the schools. As part of the study, a survey was distributed to all school superintendents and a sample of teachers, students, and principals throughout the State during the spring of 1993. The survey data, currently being analyzed, should help policymakers, school professionals, parents, students, and the general public gain a better understanding of the problem of school violence and lead to the development of and support for programs to make schools safer. The completed study is scheduled for statewide dissemination in the winter of 1994.

The Regents have presented, as a first step, a proposal to the State Legislature to reduce violence in public schools and create safe teaching and learning environments — **EMS-8**. The bill would amend the Education Law to provide, through a competitive grant process, financial assistance for the implementation of programs designed to prevent and reduce conflict and violent behavior in the public schools, including bias-related violence.

A number of other bills have been introduced in the New York State Legislature during its 1993-1994 session focusing on the prevention of school violence :

Assembly Bills

- A. 580 To establish interpersonal violence prevention education demonstration programs to teach children how to prevent the incidence of violence in their lives, i.e., family violence, acquaintance rape, racial violence, and gang violence.
- A. 687 To require the Commissioner of Education to develop an interpersonal violence prevention education package for grades 6 through 12 consisting of student pamphlets, parent pamphlets, videotapes, and other informative materials to be distributed to school districts, and to encourage the use of such material as part of the health or other related curricula or programs. In addition, the Commissioner of Education would develop an interpersonal violence prevention training package for teachers and other educational personnel, consisting of teacher lesson plans, pamphlets, videotapes, and other informative materials to be distributed to school districts, and encourage the use of such material to train school educators.
- A. 6719-A To require the Regents to report to the Governor and the Legislature annually on crimes and disruptive behavior committed in schools; provide for the installation of metal detectors in certain school buildings; require implementation of a curriculum on crime prevention; prohibit certain uses of schools and school grounds, require maintenance of a school for disruptive pupils in the City of New York; and create a matching fund program for school safety within certain school districts.
- A. 8033 To require the Commissioner of Education to promulgate rules and regulations to allow for the creation of a pilot program of telephone hotlines in public schools for the purpose of reporting criminal activity and possession of drugs and weapons on school property. The pilot program would involve three school districts in the State of New York with one being in the City of New York.

Senate Bills

- S. 340 To place metal detectors at every entrance by which students are permitted to enter any eligible school building in the State.

- S. 1928 To create "gun-free school zones," i.e., any building, structure, athletic playing field, playground, or land contained within the real property boundary line of a public or private elementary, parochial, intermediate, junior high, vocational, or high school, or a building or grounds used for educational purposes of any school, college, or university.
- S. 3825-B To amend the criminal procedure law, the family court act, and the penal law, in relation to crimes involving firearms committed on school grounds.
- S. 4349 To increase the penalties for possession of guns in a "school zone," i.e., the grounds of a public, parochial or private elementary or secondary school which provides elementary or secondary education in any grade from kindergarten up to and including the 12th grade, or within a distance of one thousand feet from the grounds of any such school.

Joint Assembly-Senate Bills

- S.242/A.357
  To place metal detectors at every entrance by which students are permitted to enter any eligible school building in the State.
- S.317-D/A.406-D
  To provide grants to school districts for the implementation of programs designed to reduce and prevent racial and cultural conflict.
- S.1983/A.3403
  To authorize the use of "drug free zone" signs by school districts.
- S.3223-A/ A.5579-A
  To extend the penal law in relation to offenses involving the use of firearms in the proximity of school grounds.
- S.3788/ A. 6225
  To enhance and make known existing Federal "gun-free school zone" provisions.

Other State Initiatives

In June 1982, California voters approved Proposition 8 which amended the State Constitution to recognize the rights of victims of crime — The Victims' Bill of Rights. Part of the Victims' Bill of Rights was a provision for safe schools that states: "... All students and staff of primary, elementary, junior high and senior high schools have the inalienable right to attend campuses which are safe, secure and peaceful..."

A New Jersey law, enacted in October 1982, requires the Commissioner of Education to monitor the incidence of violence and vandalism in the public schools of the state. To assist the Commissioner of Education in fulfilling this requirement, forms and procedures were developed for local districts and county offices of education to report occurrences of violence and vandalism. The law also requires any school employee observing or having direct knowledge from a participant or victim of an act of violence to file a report describing the incident to the school principal. Incidents are reported under the subheadings: vandalism, violence, and substance abuse. Under each subheading, there are definable types of incidents. Vandalism includes: arson; bomb offense; breaking and entering; damage to property; firework offense; theft/larceny; trespassing; and other/multiple vandalism category incidents. Violence includes: assault with a weapon; assault without a weapon; battery; possession of a weapon; robbery/extortion; sex offense; and other/multiple violence category incidents. Substance abuse includes: use-alcohol; use-marijuana; use-other; trafficking/possession - alcohol; trafficking/possession - marijuana; trafficking/possession - other; and multiple substance abuse - incidents.

CONCLUSION

Recent remarks by President Clinton pledged his Administration to seek anticrime legislation to rescue schools and communities from violence and fear. "When our children must pass through metal detectors to go to school, or worry that they'll be the victim of random drive-by shootings when they're playing in the swimming pool in the summertime, when parents are imprisoned in their own apartments behind locked doors, when we can't walk the streets of our cities without fear, we have lost an essential element of our civilization" (President Clinton, August 11, 1993). This initiative strengthens the President's national education goal for **safe, disciplined, drug-free schools**.

School violence is not an isolated phenomenon relevant only to school settings; rather it is reflective of what is happening in the larger community. However, in order for students and school personnel to carry on with the business of schooling and not be immobilized by fear, school personnel, students, and parents must acknowledge that the problem exists in the school, assess the problem and identify associated factors, and develop long- and short-term strategies to reduce or eliminate violent incidents.

For schools struggling to cope with violence, the research literature offers insights into the causes of violence and presents a range of strategies to address the problem, many of which should be pertinent to a school's specific situation:

> **School violence** — authoritarian school governance, poor interpersonal communication, ineffective leadership, other school-related factors (e.g., greater proportion of male students, school and class size, grades, and mandatory school attendance), society and community-related factors (e.g., high crime rate and the presence of fighting gangs in the schools' attendance areas, availability of weapons, drug trafficking, hate crimes, role of poverty, glamorization of violence by media, and females as victims of sexual misconduct), family-related factors (e.g., erosion of family influence, single parent families, and unsupervised children) and aggressive behavior.
>
> **School vandalism** — crime rate, residential concentration and presence of nonstudent youth around school, family intactness and discipline, school size, rules and policies enforcement, classroom control and nonclassroom supervision, coordination between faculty and administration, hostile and authoritarian attitudes on the part of teachers toward students, teachers' opinions of students, grades, and student leadership status.

Identifying the causes of school violence and vandalism is the first stage in addressing the problem. Strategies must then be developed as prevention, intervention, and response measures. The research literature suggests a range of strategies:

> **Prevention strategies** — develop clear written policies; provide preservice and in-service training for teachers and administrators; report serious problems to law enforcement authorities and develop uniform reporting procedures; develop violence-prevention, conflict resolution and other curricula; encourage positive teacher actions; respond to the needs of students and faculty and reinforce principal's role; implement counseling programs; begin violence-prevention programs in early grades; revise special education disciplinary procedures; implement security measures; establish victim support and violent offender rehabilitation programs; recognize responsibility of schools in addressing the problem; create humanistic and challenging learning environments; involve the community, parents and students in developing antiviolence programs; establish standards for student achievement and rewards; implement fair and firm discipline procedures; enact antiviolence legislation; involve students in school governance in a meaningful manner; improve interpersonal communication by dividing schools in manageable clusters; and other factors (e.g., graffiti removal and academic-based alternative programs for chronic problem students).
>
> **Intervention strategies** — implement staff in-service programs to train school personnel to stop violent actions and develop school safety plans; provide arbitration and mediation services to students who are prone to violence; improve communication with the community and all parts of the school building; involve community, parents, and students in planning

and implementing antiviolence programs; understand student population and its varied problems; plan crisis management procedures; and limit access points into school.

Response strategies — arrest perpetrator(s) immediately; contact media immediately; provide referrals for victims and offenders; establish school district safe schools/internal affairs department; develop specific programs for student offenders; offer specialized assistance to victims of violence; implement school board policies and provide retraining opportunities to assist victims of violence; separate the victims from the perpetrators of violence; curtail contact between victim and assailant; assign advocate for sexual assault victims; acknowledge and report crime; and choose the most appropriate response to violent and less violent incidents.

Concern over violence in the schools is being translated into legislative initiatives at the Federal and state levels. Legislation has been introduced in the Congress to assist states and local educational agencies address the problem. At the state level, New York, New Jersey, and California have instituted and proposed measures to stem violence in the schools.

Schools alone will never be successful in eliminating violence. To accomplish that end, the active participation of all levels of government, private organizations and agencies, students, parents, and community members is essential in the design and implementation of violence prevention programs.

APPENDIX A

Definitions

The U.S. Department of Justice in a survey on school crime throughout the United States, *School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report* (1991), made the following distinctions between property crime and violent crime:

- Property Crime: Personal larceny, with to without contact, and motor vehicle theft.
- Violent Crime: Includes the crimes of rape, robbery, and simple and aggravated assault.

The *Chancellor's Regulations on Carrying Weapons in Schools in New York City Schools* includes the following definitions of weapon:

- Firearm (including a pistol, handgun, and any gun small enough to be concealed on the body), firearm silencer, and electronic dart gun;
- Shotgun, rifle, machine gun, or any other weapon that simulates or is adaptable for use as a machine gun;
- Switchblade knife, gravity knife, and cane sword (a cane that conceals a knife);
- Billy (club), blackjack, bludgeon, chucka stick, and metal knuckles;
- Sandbag and sandclub;
- Slungshot (small, heavy weights attached to a thong);
- Explosive, incendiary bomb, and bombshell;
- Dagger, stiletto, dangerous knife, and straight razor; and
- Air gun, spring gun, or other instrument or weapon in which the propelling force is a spring or air, and any weapon in which any loaded or blank cartridge may be used (such as a BB gun).

APPENDIX B

VIOLENCE IN NEW YORK CITY HIGH SCHOOLS

1992-1993 SCHOOL YEAR

School	Incidents	Incidents per 1,000 students*	Rank
MANHATTAN			
A. Philip Randolph	12	9	43
Art and Design	15	8	47
Central Park East	0	0	105
Chelsea 26	27	3	
City As School	0	0	105
Fashion Industries	5	2	90
Fiorello H. La Guardia	9	4	82
George Washington	8	2	94
Graphic Communication Arts	22	15	20
Humanities	10	5	73
Julia Richman	39	14	22
Louis D. Brandeis	13	5	71
Lower East Side Preparatory	5	9	44
Mabel D. Bacon	1	1**	101
Manhattan Comprehensive Night High School	0	0	105
Manhattan Center for Science and Mathematics	8	6	61
Martin Luther King Jr.	22	7	53
Murry Bergtraum	10	4	81
Norman Thomas	5	2	97
Park East2	5	67	
Park West	13	6	56
Richard R. Green High School of Teaching	0	0	105
Satellite Academy	0	0	105
Seward Park	9	3	86
Stuyvesant	5	2	95
Washington Irving	20	10	36
West Side	0	0	105

VIOLENCE IN NEW YORK CITY HIGH SCHOOLS
1992-1993 SCHOOL YEAR

School	Incidents	Incidents per 1,000 students*	Rank
BRONX			
Adlai E. Stevenson	46	12	29
Alfred E. Smith	51	31	1
Bronx H. S. of Science	9	3	84
Bronx Regional	0	0	105
Christopher Columbus	41	13	25
Dewitt Clinton	47	14	23
Evander Childs	29	8	46
Grace H. Dodge	11	8	48
Harry S. Truman	35	12	26
Herbert H. Lehman	19	7	50
Hostos-Lincoln Academy	1	3	85
James Monroe	41	16	17
Jane Addams	11	7	49
John F. Kennedy	19	4	78
Morris 42	22	7	
Samuel Gompers	6	5	69
South Bronx	24	23	6
Theodore Roosevelt	52	16	12
Walton 30	11	33	
William H. Taft	79	27	2
BROOKLYN			
Abraham Lincoln	15	6	55
Automotive	21	15	18
Boys and Girls	1	0	104
Brooklyn College Academy	0	0	105
Brooklyn Technical	10	2	92
Bushwick25	12	30	
Canarsie 14	6	62	
Clara Barton	13	5	64
East New York	18	16	16
Eastern District	33	12	32
Edward R. Murrow	19	6	63

VIOLENCE IN NEW YORK CITY HIGH SCHOOLS
1992-1993 SCHOOL YEAR

School	Incidents	Incidents per 1,000 students*	Rank
Erasmus Hall	14	5	68
Fort Hamilton	9	3	89
Franklin D. Roosevelt	22	6	59
Franklin K. Lane	61	15	21
George W. Wingate	41	16	15
George Westinghouse	34	19	8
H.S. of Redirection	2	4	80
Harry Van Arsdale	17	11	35
H.S. of Telecommunication Arts and Technology	12	12	31
James Madison	28	10	39
John Dewey	26	8	45
John Jay 5	2	99	
Lafayette40	15	19	
Midwood32	11	34	
New Utrech	5	2	96
Pacific 3	7	51	
Paul Robeson	12	10	37
Prospect Heights	34	17	10
Samuel J. Tilden	14	5	65
Sarah J. Hale	41	24	3
Sheepshead Bay	20	7	52
South Shore	30	9	41
Street Academy in Brooklyn	0	0	105
Thomas Jefferson	6	3	87
William Grady	37	26	4
William H. Maxwell	3	2	91
QUEENS			
Andrew Jackson	22	10	40
August Martin	10	5	66
Aviation 3	1	100	
Bayside 6	3	88	
Beach Channel	35	16	13
Benjamin Cardozo	15	4	77

VIOLENCE IN NEW YORK CITY HIGH SCHOOLS
1992-1993 SCHOOL YEAR

School	Incidents	Incidents per 1,000 students*	Rank
Far Rockaway	12	7	54
Flushing 10	4	76	
Forest Hills	3	1	102
Francis Lewis	13	5	70
Grover Cleveland	17	6	58
Hillcrest 7	2	93	
International H.S. at La Guardia Community College	0	0	105
Jamaica 26	10	38	
John Adams	12	4	75
John Bowne	14	5	72
Long Island City	34	18	9
Martin Van Buren	2	1	103
Middle College	0	0	105
Newtown26	6	57	
Queens Vocational	5	5	74
Richmond Hill	4	2	98
Springfield Gardens	17	6	60
Thomas A. Edison	29	14	24
Townend Harris	3	3	83
William C. Bryant	37	12	27
STATEN ISLAND			
Concord 0	0	105	
Curtis 34	17	11	
New Dorp	8	4	79
Port Richmond	23	12	28
Ralph McKee	13	16	14
Staten Island Technical	0	0	105
Tottenville	33	9	42

* Rounded

** The school with the most incidents per 1,000 is ranked No. 1.

Source: New York City Board of Education, Division of School Safety.

APPENDIX C

National Crime Victimization Survey Findings

TABLE 1

STUDENTS REPORTING AT LEAST ONE VICTIMIZATION AT SCHOOL BY PERSONAL AND FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS

1989

Student Characteristic	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students Reporting Victimization at School		
		Total	Violent	Property
Sex				
Male	11,166,316	9%	2%	7%
Female	10,387,776	9%	2%	8%
Race				
White	17,306,626	9%	2%	7%
Black	3,449,488	8%	2%	7%
Other	797,978	10%	2%*	8%
Hispanic Origin				
Hispanic	2,026,968	7%	3%	5%
Non-Hispanic	19,452,697	9%	2%	8%
Not Ascertained	74,428	3%*	--	3%*
Age				
12	3,220,891	9%	2%	7%
13	3,318,714	10%	2%	8%
14	3,264,574	11%	2%	9%
15	3,214,109	9%	3%	7%
16	3,275,002	9%	2%	7%
17	3,273,628	8%	1%	7%
18	1,755,825	5%	1%*	4%
19	231,348	2%*	--	2%*

Table 1 (continued)

Student Characteristic	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students Reporting Victimization at School		
		Total	Violent	Property
Number of times family moved in last 5 years				
None	18,905,538	8%	2%	7%
Once	845,345	9%	2%*	7%
Twice	610,312	13%	3%*	11%
3 or More	1,141,555	15%	6%	9%
Not Ascertained	51,343	5%*	5%	--
Family Income				
Less than $7,500	2,041,418	8%	2%	6%
$7,500-$9,999	791,086	4%	1%*	3%
$10,000-$14,999	1,823,150	9%	3%	7%
$15,000-$24,999	3,772,445	8%	1%	8%
$25,000-$29,999	1,845,313	8%	2%	7%
$30,000-$49,999	5,798,448	10%	2%	8%
$50,000 and over	3,498,382	11%	2%	9%
Not Ascertained	1,983,849	7%	3%	5%
Place of Residence				
Central City	5,816,321	10%	2%	8%
Suburbs	10,089,207	9%	2%	7%
Nonmetropolitan Area	5,648,564	8%	1%	7%

* Estimate is based on 10 or fewer sample cases

-- Less than 0.5%

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 1.

TABLE 2

STUDENTS REPORTING AT LEAST ONE VICTIMIZATION AT SCHOOL,BY SELECTED SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

1989

School Characteristic	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students Reporting Victimization at School		
		Total	Violent	Property
Type of School				
Public	19,264,643	9%	2%	8%
Private	1,873,077	7%	1%*	6%
Not Ascertained	416,372	6%	3%*	4%*
Grade in School				
6th	1,817,511	10%	3%	8%
7th	3,170,126	9%	2%	8%
8th	3,258,506	9%	2%	8%
9th	3,390,701	11%	3%	9%
10th	3,082,441	9%	2%	7%
11th	3,223,624	8%	2%	7%
12th	3,171,819	6%	1%	5%
Other	439,364	5%	3%*	3%*

* Estimate is based on 10 or fewer cases.

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 2.

TABLE 3
AVAILABILITY OF DRUGS OR ALCOHOL AT SCHOOL
BY TYPE OF DRUG
1989

Drugs or Alcohol at School	Percent of students reporting that obtaining a drug or alcohol at school was					
	Total	Easy	Hard	Impossible	Not Known	Drug Not Known
Alcohol	100%	31%	31%	16%	22%	1%
Marijuana	100%	30%	27%	16%	25%	1%
Cocaine	100%	11%	33%	25%	31%	1%
Crack	100%	9%	29%	28%	32%	2%
Uppers/ downers	100%	20%	26%	17%	31%	5%
Other Drugs	100%	14%	27%	19%	37%	3%

Note: Detail may not total 100% because of rounding. The total number of students represented was 21,554,092.

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 3.

TABLE 4

AVAILABILITY OF DRUGS, BY SELECTED STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

1989

Student Characteristic	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students Reporting Drugs			
		Total	Available	Not Available	Not Known if Available
Sex					
Male	10,593,314	100%	69%	12%	19%
Female	9,776,470	100%	66%	11%	22%
Race					
White	16,417,105	100%	69%	11%	20%
Black	3,223,708	100%	67%	11%	22%
Other	728,971	100%	58%	18%	24%
Hispanic Origin					
Hispanic	1,884,679	100%	64%	12%	24%
Non-Hispanic	18,410,678	100%	68%	11%	20%
Not Ascertained	74,428	100%	52%	31%	16%
Age					
12	2,888,982	100%	53%	24%	23%
13	3,078,909	100%	60%	19%	21%
14	3,055,401	100%	64%	13%	24%
15	3,086,095	100%	70%	7%	23%
16	3,168,628	100%	76%	6%	18%
17	3,150,323	100%	77%	6%	17%
18	1,721,111	100%	78%	6%	16%
19	220,336	100%	78%	5%	17%

TABLE 4 (continued)

Student Characteristic	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students Reporting Victimization at School			
		Total	Available	Not Available	Not Known if available
Family Income					
Less than $15,000	4.328,990	100%	67%	13%	20%
$15,000-$29,999	5,291,904	100%	68%	11%	21%
$30,000-$49,999	5,551,030	100%	68%	11%	21%
$50,000 or more	3,321,663	100%	70%	11%	18%
Not ascertained	1,876,197	100%	66%	13%	21%
Location of Residence					
Central City	5,418,166	100%	66%	13%	21%
Suburbs	9,640,427	100%	67%	11%	22%
Nonmetropolitan area	5,311,191	100%	71%	11%	18%

Note: Detail may not total 100% because of rounding. Cases in which the respondent did not know the types of drugs were excluded. "Available" includes students who said drugs were easy or hard to get at school; "not available" includes those saying drugs were impossible to get at school.

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 4.

TABLE 5

AVAILABILITY OF DRUGS, BY SELECTED SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

1989

School Characteristic	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students Reporting Drugs			
		Total	Available	Not Available	Not Known if Available
Type of School					
Public	18,215,207	100%	70%	9%	21%
Private	1,747,408	100%	52%	36%	13%
Not Known	407,170	100%	66%	8%	26%
Grade Level					
6th	1,627,384	100%	50%	26%	24%
7th	2,918,290	100%	61%	17%	22%
8th	3,034,895	100%	60%	20%	21%
9th	3,236,182	100%	69%	7%	24%
10th	2,966,953	100%	73%	7%	20%
11th	3,104,712	100%	79%	5%	16%
12th	3,105,428	100%	78%	6%	16%
Other	375,940	100%	44%	26%	30%
Gangs					
Present	3,155,169	100%	78%	6%	16%
Not Present	16,065,729	100%	66%	13%	20%
Not Known	1,148,887	100%	62%	3%	34%

Note: Detail may not total 100% because of rounding. Cases in which the respondent did not know the types of drugs were excluded. "Available" includes students who said drugs were easy or hard to get at school; "not available" includes those saying drugs were impossible to get at school.

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 4.

TABLE 6

VICTIMIZATION OF STUDENTS, BY AVAILABILITY OF ALCOHOL OR DRUGS AT SCHOOL

1989

Alcohol or Drug and Availability	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students Victimized		
		Total	Violent	Property
Alcohol				
Easy	6,637,706	11%	2%	9%
Hard	6,712,646	9%	2%	7%
Impossible	3,407,854	8%	2%	7%
Not Known	4,673,642	8%	2%	6%
Marijuana				
Easy	6,568,766	11%	3%	9%
Hard	5,918,567	8%	1%	7%
Impossible	3,494,543	8%	2%	7%
Not Known	5,396,256	8%	2%	6%
Cocaine				
Easy	2,297,249	11%	4%	9%
Hard	7,034,616	10%	2%	8%
Impossible	5,354,381	9%	2%	7%
Not Known	6,655,588	8%	2%	6%
Crack				
Easy	1,862,226	12%	4%	9%
Hard	6,338,322	9%	2%	7%
Impossible	6,018,289	10%	2%	8%
Not Known	6,988,776	8%	2%	6%

TABLE 6 (continued)

1989

Alcohol or Drug and Availability	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students Victimized		
		Total	Violent	Property
Uppers/downers				
Easy	4,399,177	12%	3%	10%
Hard	5,555,802	8%	1%	7%
Impossible	3,723,187	8%	2%	6%
Not Known	6,760,441	8%	2%	6%
Other drugs				
Easy	2,992,401	13%	4%	10%
Hard	5,895,744	8%	1%	7%
Impossible	4,019,868	8%	1%	7%
Not Known	8,029,741	8%	2%	7%

Note: The category "drug not known" has been excluded.

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 5.

TABLE 7

STUDENTS EVER FEARING AN ATTACK, BY AVAILABILITY OF DRUGS AT SCHOOL

1989

Drugs at School	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students Ever Fearing an Attack	
		At School	Going to and From School
Available	13,846,874	25%	16%
Not Available	2,363,931	13%	10%
Not Known if Available	4,158,980	17%	12%

Note: Cases in which the types of drugs were not known to the respondent were excluded. "Available" includes students who said drugs were easy or hard to get at school; "not available" includes those saying drugs were impossible to get at school.

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 5.

TABLE 8

DRUG PREVENTION MEASURES, BY AVAILABILITY OF DRUGS AT SCHOOL

1989

Drugs at School	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students Reporting School Drug Prevention Measures			
		Total	No Action	Some Action Taken	Not Known
Available	13,846,874	100%	9%	91%	1%
Not Available	2,363,931	100%	24%	74%	1%
Not Known if Available	4,158,980	100%	11%	86%	3%

Note: Detail may not total 100% because of rounding. Cases in which the types of drugs were not known to the respondent were excluded. "Available" includes students who said drugs were easy or hard to get at school; "not available" includes those saying drugs were impossible to get at school.

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 5.

TABLE 9

TYPES OF DRUG PREVENTION MEASURES TAKEN AT SCHOOLS

1989

Drug Prevention Measures	Percent of Students Reporting
Locker Searches	46%
Security Guards	25%
Hall Patrols	71%
Restroom Checks	43%
Other	10%
No Action Taken	11%

Note: Detail does not total 100% because respondents may have reported more than one measure.

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 5.

TABLE 10

ATTENDANCE AT DRUG EDUCATION CLASSES DURING THE PREVIOUS 6 MONTHS, BY SELECTED STUDENT AND SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

1989

Student and School Characteristic	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students Who Had Attended Drug Education Classes During the Previous 6 Months		
		Total	Yes	No
Sex				
Male	11,067,277	100%	39%	61%
Female	10,288,418	100%	40%	60%
Race				
White	17,148,439	100%	40%	60%
Black	3,416,622	100%	36%	64%
Other	790,634	100%	39%	61%
Hispanic Origin				
Hispanic	2,014,518	100%	38%	62%
Non-Hispanic	19,268,603	100%	40%	60%
Not Ascertained	72,575	100%	45%	55%
Location of Residence				
Central City	5,775,761	100%	35%	65%
Suburbs	9,979,126	100%	40%	60%
Nonmetropolitan Area	5,600,808	100%	44%	56%
Type of School				
Public	19,104,156	100%	39%	61%
Private	1,852,175	100%	41%	59%
Not Known	399,364	100%	42%	58%

TABLE 10 (continued)

1989

Student and School Characteristic	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students Who Had Attended Drug Education Classes During the Previous 6 Months		
		Total	Yes	No
Grade Level				
6th	1,797,134	100%	56%	44%
7th	3,144,651	100%	48%	52%
8th	3,213,531	100%	47%	53%
9th	3,374,698	100%	36%	64%
10th	3,061,084	100%	35%	65%
11th	3,188,797	100%	33%	67%
12th	3,154,843	100%	27%	73%
Other	420,956	100%	43%	57%
Drug Availability				
Available	13,751,166	100%	40%	60%
Not Available	2,343,943	100%	44%	56%
Not Known	4,095,275	100%	35%	65%

Note: Detail may not total 100% because of rounding. Cases in which the respondent did not know the types of drugs or whether he or she had attended drug education classes were excluded. "Available" includes students who said drugs were easy or hard to get at school; "not available" includes those saying drugs were impossible to get at school.

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 6.

TABLE 11

AVAILABILITY OF ALCOHOL AT SCHOOL, BY SELECTED STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

1989

Student Characteristic	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students Reporting Alcohol			
		Total	Available	Not Available	Not Known if Available
Sex					
Male	11,101,022	100%	63%	16%	20%
Female	10,330,826	100%	61%	15%	23%
Race					
White	17,212,097	100%	63%	16%	21%
Black	3,421,773	100%	60%	15%	26%
Other	797,978	100%	54%	21%	25%
Hispanic Origin					
Hispanic	2,007,971	100%	56%	18%	26%
Non-Hispanic	19,349,450	100%	63%	16%	21%
Not Ascertained	74,428	100%	46%	31%	23%
Age					
12	3,191,908	100%	45%	28%	27%
13	3,292,209	100%	54%	21%	25%
14	3,232,719	100%	59%	15%	25%
15	3,203,049	100%	65%	11%	24%
16	3,270,114	100%	70%	11%	19%
17	3,262,485	100%	74%	11%	15%
18	1,749,721	100%	74%	12%	14%
19	229,644	100%	66%	11%	24%

TABLE 11 (continued)

1989

Student Characteristic	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students Reporting Alcohol			
		Total	Available	Not Available	Not Known if Available
Family Income					
Less Than $15,000	4,615,648	100%	58%	18%	24%
$15,000-$29,000	5,594,006	100%	63%	15%	22%
$30,000-$49,999	5,774,766	100%	64%	15%	22%
$50,000 or More	3,486,562	100%	65%	17%	18%
Not Ascertained	1,960,866	100%	62%	16%	23%
Location of Residence					
Central City	5,770,121	100%	58%	18%	24%
Suburbs	10,046,860	100%	62%	15%	23%
Nonmetropolitan Area	5,614,868	100%	67%	15%	18%

Note: Detail may not total 100% because of rounding. Cases in which alcohol was not known to the respondent were excluded. "Available" includes students who said alcohol was easy or hard to get at school; "not available" includes those saying alcohol was impossible to get at school.

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 7.

TABLE 12

AVAILABILITY OF ALCOHOL, BY SELECTED SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

1989

School Characteristic	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students Reporting Drugs			
		Total	Available	Not Available	Not Known if Available
Type of School					
Public	19,151,251	100%	63%	14%	23%
Private	1,866,688	100%	52%	36%	12%
Not Known	413,910	100%	61%	10%	29%
Grade Level					
6th	1,803,734	100%	42%	30%	28%
7th	3,143,322	100%	54%	20%	26%
8th	3,242,654	100%	54%	22%	24%
9th	3,369,959	100%	65%	10%	25%
10th	3,066,172	100%	68%	12%	20%
11th	3,208,228	100%	73%	10%	17%
12th	3,171,819	100%	75%	12%	13%
Other	425,960	100%	36%	32%	32%

Note: Detail may not total 100% because of rounding. Cases in which alcohol was not known to the respondent were excluded. "Available" includes students who said drugs were easy or hard to get at school; "not available" includes those saying drugs were impossible to get at school.

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 7.

TABLE 13

STUDENTS EVER FEARING AN ATTACK, BY AVAILABILITY OF ALCOHOL AT SCHOOL

1989

Alcohol at School	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students Ever Fearing an Attack	
		At School	Going to and From School
Available	13,350,352	24%	16%
Not Available	3,407,854	17%	12%
Not Known if Available	4,673,642	19%	14%

Note: Cases in which alcohol was not known to the respondent were excluded. "Available" includes students who said drugs were easy or hard to get at school; "not available" includes those saying drugs were impossible to get at school.

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 7.

TABLE 14
STUDENTS REPORTING GANGS AT SCHOOL AND ATTACKS ON TEACHERS
1989

Characteristic	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students Reporting
Street Gangs at School		
Present	3,300,826	15%
Not Present	17,041,519	79%
Not Known or Not Ascertained	1,211,747	5%
Frequency of Fights Between Gang Members*		
Never	1,678,041	37%
Once or Twice a Year	843,607	19%
Once or Twice a Month	743,649	16%
Once or Twice a Week	337,868	7%
Almost Every Day	219,516	5%
Not Ascertained	689,894	15%
Attacks or Threats on Teachers		
Yes	3,468,631	16%
No	15,639,976	73%
Not Known or Not Ascertained	2,445,485	11%

Note: Percentage distribution may not total 100% because of rounding.
* Excludes cases in which the student indicated that there were no gangs at school.

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 8

TABLE 15

VICTIMIZATION OF STUDENTS, BY GANG PRESENCE AT SCHOOL

1989

Gangs	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students Reporting Victimization		
		Total	Violent	Property
Present	3,300,826	12%	3%	9%
Not Present	17,041,519	8%	2%	7%
Not Known	1,211,747	8%	2%	7%

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 8.

TABLE 16
STUDENTS REPORTING GANG PRESENCE AT SCHOOL,
BY SELECTED STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS
1989

Student Characteristic	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students Reporting Gangs
Sex		
Male	11,166,316	16%
Female	10,387,776	15%
Race		
White	17,306,626	14%
Black	3,449,488	20%
Other	797,978	25%
Hispanic Origin		
Hispanic	2,026,968	32%
Non-Hispanic	19,452,697	14%
Not Ascertained	74,428	12%
Age		
12	3,220,891	12%
13	3,318,714	15%
14	3,264,574	18%
15	3,214,109	16%
16	3,275,002	16%
17	3,273,628	15%
18	1,755,825	14%
19	231,348	17%

TABLE 16 (continued)

1989

Student Characteristic	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students Reporting Gangs
Family Income		
Less than $7,500	2,041,418	17%
$7,500-$9,999	791,086	21%
$10,000-$14,999	1,823,150	21%
$15,000-24,999	3,772,445	18%
$25,000-$29,999	1,845,313	16%
$30,000-$49,999	5,798,448	13%
$50,000 and over	3,498,382	11%
Not Ascertained	1,983,849	16%
Place of Residence		
Central City	5,816,321	25%
Suburbs	10,089,207	14%
Nonmetropolitan Area	5,648,564	8%

* Estimate is based on 10 or fewer sample cases.

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 8.

TABLE 17

STUDENTS FEARING AN ATTACK OR AVOIDING AREAS INSIDE OR OUTSIDE OF SCHOOL, BY GANG PRESENCE AT SCHOOL

1989

Gangs	Total Number of Students	Percent of Student			
		Ever Fearing an Attack		Avoiding Areas	
		At School	Going to or From School	Inside School	Outside School
Present	3,300,826	35%	24%	13%	8%
Not Present	17,041,519	18%	12%	3%	2%
Not Known	1,211,747	34%	31%	8%	4%

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 8.

TABLE 18
STUDENTS FEARING ATTACK, BY LOCATION AND WHETHER VICTIMIZED BY VIOLENT CRIME DURING PREVIOUS 6 MONTHS
1989

Location of Feared Attack and Whether Victim of Violent Crime	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students Fearing an Attack				
		Total	Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Most Times
At School						
Violent Crime Victims	430,819	100%	47%	28%	18%	7%
Nonvictims	16,672,027	100%	81%	15%	4%	-
In Travel to and From School						
Violent Crime Victims	430,819	100%	74%	15%	8%	3%*
Nonvictims	16,643,909	100%	87%	10%	3%	-

Note: Percentage may not total 100% because of rounding. The category "not ascertained" has been excluded on each fear variable.
* Estimate is based on 10 or fewer sample cases.
- Less than 0.5%

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 9.

TABLE 19
STUDENTS AVOIDING PLACES AT SCHOOL OUT OF FEAR,
BY VICTIMIZATION DURING PREVIOUS 6 MONTHS
1989

Type of Victimization at School	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students Ever Avoiding Places at School Out of Fear
Any Victimization		
Yes	1,927,162	12%
No	19,626,931	5%
Any Violent Victimization		
Yes	430,819	25%
No	21,123,273	5%
Any Property Victimization		
Yes	1,574,354	10%
No	19,979,738	6%

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 9.

TABLE 20

STUDENTS AVOIDING PLACES INSIDE OR OUTSIDE SCHOOL OUT OF FEAR OF CRIME

1989

Place Avoided	Percent of Students Avoiding Places of Fear of Crime
Shortcut	1.5%
Inside School	
Entrance	1.3%
Hallways	2.1%
Cafeteria	1.6%
Restroom	2.7%
Other Places	1.1%
Outside School	
Parking Lot	1.3%
Other Places	1.7%

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 9.

TABLE 21
STUDENTS AVOIDING PLACES AT SCHOOL OUT OF FEAR, OR EVER FEARING AN ATTACK
BY SELECTED STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS
1989

Student Characteristic	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students		
		Avoiding Places at School	Ever Fearing an Attack	
			At School	Going to and from School
Sex				
Male	11,166,316	6%	22%	14%
Female	10,387,776	6%	21%	16%
Race				
White	17,306,626	6%	22%	13%
Black	3,449,488	7%	22%	21%
Other	797,978	6%	22%	18%
Hispanic Origin				
Hispanic	2,026,968	8%	26%	22%
Non-Hispanic	19,452,697	6%	21%	14%
Not Ascertained	74,428	14%*	23%*	19%*
Age				
12	3,220,891	8%	27%	18%
13	3,318,714	7%	27%	17%
14	3,264,574	7%	24%	15%
15	3,214,109	6%	21%	13%
16	3,275,002	5%	20%	14%
17	3,273,628	4%	17%	12%
18	1,755,825	4%	13%	10%
19	231,348	8%*	20%	15%

TABLE 21 (continued)

Student Characteristic	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students		
		Avoiding Places at School	Ever Fearing an Attack	
			At School	Going to and from School
Number of Times Family Moved in Last 5 Years				
None	18,905,538	6%	21%	15%
Once	845,345	5%	18%	11%
Twice	610,312	8%	27%	16%
3 or More	1,141,555	6%	26%	16%
Not Ascertained	51,343	7%	24%*	14%*
Family Income				
Less Than $7,500	2,041,418	8%	24%	18%
$7,500-$9,999	791,086	9%	25%	18%
$10,000-$14,999	1,823,150	8%	25%	19%
$15,000-24,999	3,772,445	6%	23%	15%
$25,000-$29,999	1,845,313	6%	21%	15%
$30,000-$49,999	5,798,448	5%	21%	13%
$50,000 and over	3,498,382	4%	19%	11%
Not Ascertained	1,983,849	5%	18%	16%
Place of Residence				
Central City	5,816,321	8%	24%	19%
Suburbs	10,089,207	5%	20%	12%
Nonmetropolitan Area	5,648,564	6%	22%	13%

* Estimate is based on 10 or fewer sample cases.

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 10.

TABLE 22

STUDENTS AVOIDING PLACES AT SCHOOL OUT OF FEAR, OR EVER FEARING AN ATTACK, BY LOCATION, RACE, AND HISPANIC ORIGIN

1989

Location, Race, and Hispanic Origin	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students		
		Avoiding Places at School	Ever Fearing an Attack	
			At School	Going to and from School
Central City				
Race				
White	3,769,413	7%	25%	18%
Black	1,766,798	8%	22%	24%
Other	280,111	11%	20%	18%
Hispanic Origin				
Hispanic	964,145	10%	28%	26%
Non-Hispanic	4,826,185	7%	23%	18%
Not Ascertained	25,992	11%*	7%*	7%*
Suburbs				
Race				
White	8,776,628	5%	20%	12%
Black	919,265	4%	21%	15%
Other	393,714	4%	20%	19%
Hispanic Origin				
Hispanic	783,655	6%	23%	21%
Non-Hispanic	9,278,865	5%	20%	12%
Not Ascertained	26,687	21%	38%*	33%*

TABLE 22 (continued)

Location, Race, and Hispanic Origin	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students		
		Avoiding Places at School	Ever Fearing an Attack	
			At School	Going to and from School
Nonmetropolitan Areas				
Race				
White	4,760,985	6%	21%	12%
Black	763,425	9%	24%	20%
Other	124,154	4%	32%	13%*
Hispanic Origin				
Hispanic	279,168	6%	24%	13%
Non-Hispanic	5,347,647	6%	22%	14%
Not Ascertained	21,749	9%*	23%*	16%*

* Estimate is based on 10 or fewer sample cases.

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 11.

TABLE 23

STUDENTS AVOIDING PLACES AT SCHOOL OUT OF FEAR, OR EVER FEARING AN ATTACK, BY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

1989

School Characteristic	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students		
		Avoiding Places at School	Ever Fearing an Attack	
			At School	Going to and from School
Type of School				
Public	19,264,643	6%	22%	15%
Private	1,873,077	3%	13%	14%
Not Ascertained	416,372	7%	30%	16%
Grade in School				
6th	1,817,511	8%	25%	18%
7th	3,170,126	9%	29%	18%
8th	3,258,506	6%	25%	17%
9th	3,390,701	7%	22%	13%
10th	3,082,441	5%	22%	14%
11th	3,223,624	4%	16%	13%
12th	3,171,819	4%	15%	11%
Other	439,364	7%	21%	15%

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 11.

TABLE 24
STUDENTS EVER FEARING CRIME OR AVOIDING AREAS OUTSIDE SCHOOL, BY MODE OF TRANSPORTATION TO AND FROM SCHOOL
1989

Transportation to and From School	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students		
		Ever Fearing an Attack Going to and From School	Avoiding Out of Fear	
			Shortest Route	Places Outside School Building
Walking	2,725,213	25%	4%	6%
School Bus	7,965,766	13%	1%	3%
Public Transportation	808,325	31%	4%	6%
Car	7,257,804	8%	1%	2%
Other, Including Combined Modes	2,757,608	20%	2%	3%
Not Ascertained	39,376	-	-	-

- Less than 0.5%.

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 12.

TABLE 25
STUDENTS REPORTING THAT THEY HAD TAKEN SOMETHING TO SCHOOL TO PROTECT THEMSELVES
1989

Student Characteristic	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students Who Had Taken a Weapon or Object to School For Protection
Sex		
Male	11,166,316	3%
Female	10,387,776	1%
Race		
White	17,306,626	2%
Black	3,449,488	2%
Other	797,978	2%
Hispanic Origin		
Hispanic	2,026,968	2%
Non-Hispanic	19,452,697	2%
Not Ascertained	74,428	-
Place of Residence		
Central City	5,816,321	3%
Suburbs	10,089,207	2%
Nonmetroplitan Area	5,648,564	1%

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 12.

TABLE 26
SECURITY MEASURES TAKEN AT SCHOOL,
BY SELECTED STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS
1989

Student Characteristic	Total Number of Students Who Changed Classrooms*	Percent of Students Reporting Teachers Monitor Class Changes	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students Reporting	
				Hall Patrols During Day	Visitor Sign-in
Sex					
Male	10,179,574	70%	11,166,316	65%	91%
Female	9,629,228	72%	10,387,776	65%	92%
Race					
White	15,926,642	70%	17,306,626	63%	91%
Black	3,161,172	79%	3,449,488	74%	95%
Other	720,988	51%	797,978	66%	90%
Hispanic Origin					
Hispanic	1,827,924	68%	2,026,968	72%	92%
Non-Hispanic	17,916,970	71%	19,452,697	64%	91%
Not Ascertained	63,907	64%	74,428%	66%	100%
Age					
12	2,372,119	74%	3,220,891	51%	88%
13	3,007,975	79%	3,318,714	60%	91%
14	3,101,059	74%	3,264,574	64%	92%
15	3,113,560	69%	3,214,109	70%	93%
16	3,166,217	67%	3,275,002	71%	93%
17	3,198,295	67%	3,273,628	70%	92%
18	1,647,956	66%	1,755,825	69%	92%
19	201,619	68%	231,348	71%	90%

TABLE 26 (continued)

Student Characteristic	Total Number of Students Who Changed Classrooms*	Percent of Students Reporting Teachers Monitor Class Changes	Total Number of Students	Percent of Students Reporting	
				Hall Patrols During Day	Visitor Sign-in
Family Income					
Less Than $7,500	1,824,165	76%	2,041,418	67%	93%
$7,500-$9,999	702,516	77%	791,086	69%	95%
$10,000-$14,999	1,615,366	75%	1,823,150	63%	92%
$15,000-24,999	3,463,960	72%	3,772,445	66%	91%
$25,000-$29,999	1,714,809	73%	1,845,313	64%	91%
$30,000-$49,999	5,352,099	72%	5,798,448	64%	91%
$50,000 and over	3,306,509	60%	3,498,382	62%	90%
Not Ascertained	1,829,377	70%	1,983,849	66%	93%
Place of Residence					
Central City	5,217,390	71%	5,816,321	69%	91%
Suburbs	9,380,062	68%	10,089,207	63%	91%
Nonmetropolitan Area	5,211,349	77%	5,648,564	62%	92%

* Excludes students who remained in the same classroom all day.

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 12.

TABLE 27
DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS THAT STUDENTS REPORTED,
BY INFRACTIONS
1989

Disciplinary Action	Percent of Students Reporting What Happens to a Student Caught			
	Not Respecting a Teacher	Fighting	Drunk at School	Cutting Class
Nothing	2%	-	-	1%
Disciplined by a Teacher	19%	5%	2%	5%
Sent to the Principal's Office	52%	44%	28%	30%
Parents are Notified	21%	26%	27%	25%
Detention	38%	20%	5%	39%
Suspension	25%	66%	67%	38%
Other	10%	9%	17%	11%
Not Known	3%	2%	15%	8%

Note: Detail will not total 100% because respondents may have reported more than on action for each infraction. The number of students represented was 21,554,092.
- Less than 0.5%

Source: U.S. Department of Justice. "School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report," 1991, p. 13.

Bibliography

Barbanel, J. "School Crime Rises 16%, Prompting Security Moves." *The New York Times*, September 16, 1993, p. B3.

Becker, D.C. "Impact of Crime and Violence on Schooling: Is There a Solution?" *Contemporary Education*, Fall 1983, pp. 45-47.

Berger, M. *Violence in the Schools: Causes and Remedies*. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1974.

Bullock, L.M., Reilly, T.F. and Donahue, C.A. "School Violence and What Teachers Can Do About It." *Contemporary Education*, Fall 1983, pp. 40-44.

Center for Disease Control. *1990 Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System*. Washington, D.C.: US Department of Health and Human Services, 1992.

Chira, S. "Student Poll Finds Wide Use of Guns." *The New York Times*, July 20, 1993, p. A8.

Commission on Violence and Youth. *Reduction and Prevention of Violence*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1992.

Darling-Hammond, L. *Student Violence and Vandalism: Some Answers to a Serious Problem*. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the National School Boards Association, Washington, D.C., April 1979.

Federal Bureau of Investigations. *Uniform Crime Reports for the United States, 1991*. Washington, D.C.: US Department of Justice, 1992.

Fingerhut, L. A. and J. C. Kleinman. "International and Interstate Comparisons of Homicide Among Young Males." *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 263, 24, 1990, pp. 3293-3295.

Gaustad, J. *Schools Attack the Roots of Violence*. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, College of Education, University of Oregon, 1991.

Gaustad, J. *Gangs*. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, College of Education, University of Oregon, 1990.

Guyer, B. et al. "Intentional Injuries Among Children and Adolescents in Massachusetts." *New England Journal of Medicine*, 321, 1989, pp. 1584-1589.

Harrington-Lueker, D. "Blown Away by School Violence." *The Education Digest*, November 1992, 50-53.

Hiatt, D.B. *Avenue to Safe Schools: Research, Policy and Practice*. Malibu, California: Pepperdine University, 1987.

Hranitz, J.R., and E.A. Eddowes. "Violence: A Crisis in Homes and Schools." *Childhood Education*, Fall 1990, pp. 4-7.

Hull, J.D. "A Boy and His Gun." *Time*, August 2, 1993, pp. 21-27.

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority. *Crime in the Schools*. Illinois, 1992.

Kadel, S. and J. Follman. *Reducing School Violence*. South Eastern Regional Vision for Education (SERVE), March 1993.

Kantrowitz, B. "Wild in the Streets." *Newsweek*, August 2, 1993, pp. 40-46.

Kean, M.H. *School Response to Violence and Vandalism: An Urban District's Perspective*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association on School Discipline: Research, Policies and Practices, Los Angeles, California, April 1981.

McFadden, R. "Crime in Schools is Said to Rise by 29%." *The New York Times*, September 4, 1992, p. B2.

Mole, O.C. (Ed.). *Student Discipline Strategies: Research and Practice*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1990.

Mole, O.C. "Student Misconduct and Intervention." *School Safety*, Winter 1991, pp. 4-7.

National Education Association. *Goals 2000: Mobilizing for Action: Achieving the National Education Goals*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1991.

National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. *Violent Schools — Safe Schools: The Safe School Study Report to the Congress*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Printing Office, 1978.

National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. *School Crime: The Problems and Some Attempted Solutions*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1979.

National School Safety Center (NSSC). *Student and Staff Victimization: NSSC Resource Paper*. Sacramento, California: National School Safety Center, 1986.

National School Safety Center (NSSC). *Weapons in Schools: NSSC Resource Center*. Malibu, California: National School Safety Center, Pepperdine University, 1989.

New York City Public Schools. "Fernández Announces Comprehensive School Safety Program." New York City, September 4, 1992.

New York Martin Luther King, Jr. Institute for Nonviolence and Commission. *Violence as a Public Health Issue: Its Impact on Children and Youth*. Albany, New York: King Institute for Nonviolence and Commission, 1992.

New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services. Uniform Crime Reporting System. *Crime and Justice Annual Report*. Albany, New York: June 1992.

New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services. *A Strategy for Action Against Gun-Related Violence*. Albany, New York: June 1992.

New York State Education Department. *New York State Youth Risk Behavior Survey 1991 Findings*. Albany, New York, 1992.

New York State United Teachers (NYSUT). *Conflict in the Classroom*. Albany, New York: 1993.

Quarles, C.L. *School Violence: A Survival Guide for School Staff*. Washington, D.C.: National Educational Association, 1989.

Rich, J.M. "School Violence: Four Theories Explain Why It Happens." *NASSP Bulletin*, November 1981, pp. 64-71.

Sawyer, K.A. *The Right to Safe Schools: A Newly Recognized Inalienable Right*. Malibu, California: National School Safety Center, Pepperdine University, 1983.

Stagliano, P.A. and I.A. Hyman. "Department of Education Activities to Reduce School Violence and Vandalism." *Phi Delta Kappan*, September 1983, pp. 67-68.

"Survey Finds School Violence Hits 1 in 4 Students," *The New York Times*, Friday, December 17, 1993, p. A-37.

Toby, J. Crime in American Public Schools. *Public Interest*, Winter 1980, pp. 18-42.

United Federation of Teachers (UFT). *Report of the School Safety Department for the 1989-90 School Year*. New York City: United Federation of Teachers, 1990.

United States Department of Education. *National Educational Longitudinal Study*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990.

United States Department of Justice. *Teenage Victims: A National Crime Survey Report*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, May 1991.

United States Department of Justice. *Violent Crime in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 1991.

United States Department of Justice. *Crime in the United States, 1991: Uniform Crime Reports*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, August 1992.

United States Department of Justice. *School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, September 1991.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained
upon request to:

NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
OFFICE FOR PLANNING, RESEARCH AND SUPPORT SERVICES
EDUCATION BUILDING ADDITION, ROOM 375
ALBANY, NEW YORK 12234

(518) 474-1311
Fax (518) 486-2179

80

3-003246
93-584

New York State Education Department
Albany, New York 12234

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Albany, N.Y.
Permit No. 293